

Kollin, to be senior assistant sanitary engineer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 6, 1966.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Unto Thee, O Lord, do I lift up my soul.—Psalm 25: 1.*

O spirit of the living God, whose still, small voice still summons us to turn aside from the feverish ways of foolish men, drop Thy still dews of quietness, till our strivings cease; take from our souls the strain and stress, and let our ordered lives confess the beauty of Thy peace.

In this mood we come this day and bow our hearts at this altar of prayer. May we be led into green pastures, beside still waters, and find restoration of spirit and a renewal of our faith in Thee. Even though we walk through the valley of the shadow of death we will fear no evil for Thou art with us, strengthening us and supporting us.

Bless Thou the Members of this House that they may have wisdom and faith and courage for the experiences of this day, and may they never fail man nor Thee. So may we and other nations together find the way to peace. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 16559. An act to amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 to authorize the establishment and operation of sea grant colleges and programs by initiating and supporting programs of education and research in the various fields relating to the development of marine resources, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (H.R. 13712) entitled "An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protector to additional employees, to raise the minimum wage, and for other purposes."

### RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

### JOINT MEETING OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

The SPEAKER of the House presided. The Doorkeeper, Hon. William M. Miller, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to conduct the President of the Republic of the Philippines into the Chamber the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. BOGGS; the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. ZABLOCKI; the gentleman from California, Mr. MOSS; the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. GERALD R. FORD; the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ARENDT; and the gentlewoman from Ohio, Mrs. BOLTON.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to accompany the President of the Republic of the Philippines into the Chamber the Senator from Montana, Mr. MANSFIELD; the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. LONG; the Senator from Florida, Mr. SMATHERS; the Senator from Georgia, Mr. RUSSELL; the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. FULBRIGHT; the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DIRKSEN; the Senator from Iowa, Mr. HICKENLOOPER; the Senator from California, Mr. KUCHEL; the Senator from Vermont, Mr. AIKEN; and the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. SALTONSTALL.

The Doorkeeper announced the ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m., the Doorkeeper announced the President of the Republic of the Philippines.

The President of the Republic of the Philippines, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of Congress, our country today is honored to have in its midst one of the world's most dynamic leaders from one of Asia's most vital countries, tied to us by true bonds of friendship.

Our Houses of Congress are also honored to convene in joint meeting to hear the message of a friend. Our distin-

guished guest comes to us as a veteran of our forces, a much decorated hero of epic battles for freedom and security, a statesman of high ideals, whose vision has already found responsive chords in those reaches of the world where aggression once again is on the move and where free men, once more, are rallying to the cause of freedom.

It is my great privilege, my colleagues, and I deem it a high honor, to present to you His Excellency Ferdinand E. Marcos, President of the Republic of the Philippines.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

### ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

President MARCOS. Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, distinguished Members of Congress, ladies and gentlemen, I must first thank the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives for his generous introduction.

When your distinguished diplomat by instinct and by necessity, Vice President HUMPHREY, extended to me the invitation of your great leader President Johnson to visit the United States in his now well-storied and effective trips to Asia, I did not expect the distinct honor of addressing a joint session of the U.S. Congress.

For there is no more noble forum than the U.S. Congress. It is the Foro Romano, the Roman Forum of the modern world. For, indeed, in our century, you are more than the voices of the American people or of American civilization. The voices that speak here speak to every man of the world. And it is here, since the 18th century, that the issues of modern times have been expressed and debated. Your decisions impinge upon the lives of the lowly and powerful alike.

Conscious of these circumstances, I come as an Asian, and I come with a message from Asia and especially my country, the Philippines.

For, in culmination of a novel experiment in government, the United States dismantled its colonial machinery in my country some 20 years ago on July 4, 1946. It is as the elected representative of an Asian nation of 32 million people whose independence and destiny in the modern world had been the subject of debate in this Hall, that I stand before you today.

I come before you as the bearer of these messages.

#### FIRST MESSAGE—FRATERNAL AFFECTION

The first is a message of fraternal affection from the Filipino people.

America occupies a special place in Philippine hearts. So do the American people. And we Filipinos, for our part, are proud to be counted among America's friends and allies.

I have journeyed 10,000 miles across the Pacific and continental America. I have come from Asia, from what some may describe as another world. But I feel at home in your midst.

For here in America I breathe a native air, the air of freedom that has become as much the breath of life for

our young Republic as it has been for yours for nearly 200 years.

And in this inner citadel of American democracy, in this Congress of the United States, where the vital pulse of freedom beats strong and true, my own heart is at ease.

At ease and full. For any citizen of the free world, to stand here is to remember how a great Nation was formed in liberty tempered by law. How the greatest of democracies flourished in freedom, and became, in two global wars, the salvation of the world. And now, at the summit of its power, it is called upon to lead in translating into reality the most cherished of humanity's hopes: peace with justice, in a world rebuilt upon a moral order that insures survival and growth even under the shadow of manmade total destruction.

For a Filipino like myself, to stand here is also to remember that in this kindly land lies one of the fountainheads of his own country's liberties, that from here emanated the generous impulse that made possible a new birth of freedom in the Pacific, that in a very real sense the Philippines is a sister republic of the United States.

That new birth of freedom in our island nation was but the first of many. The independence of the Philippines initiated the dismantling of colonialism in Asia, a historic process that was to extend to Africa and eventually become worldwide. To America belongs the pioneer's honor for bringing about one of the glories of our age: the vast extension of the frontiers of freedom through the emergence of so many new sovereign states.

Filipinos believe that he who does not look back to his origins will not reach his goal. This belief applies to nations as well as men. When I say that we Filipinos have a special regard for America, I look back to a Philippine-American association of more than half a century, during which a friendship was formed strong enough to endure the trials of war, and I hope rich enough in living values to meet the varied and stern challenges of peace.

#### THE REVOLUTION OF 1898

I look back and it was precisely this spirit of prevailing freedom in the United States, the ripeness of emancipation in your society, that made the Philippine revolutionary leaders in 1898 come into consultation and some terms of partnership with Admiral Dewey, even before a single American had landed on our shores.

The facts are in history: the agreement between President Aguinaldo and Adm. George Dewey; the consensus of opinion between the Filipinos fighting an ancient monarchy and a colonial regime and the Americans regarding the procedure of our finally realizing freedom.

#### THE PHILIPPINE-AMERICAN WAR

It matters not now to many what the true agreement was between American representatives and Filipino revolutionaries in Hong Kong—as to whether you promised independence, denied it, and claimed the Philippines as a purchase for \$20 million—thus starting the bloody

war between your country and mine of 1898 to 1902.

#### BATAAN AND CORREGIDOR

For you redeemed all of these with such an enlightened colonial policy that the Filipino committed himself to destruction in the frontlines of the lost battles of Bataan and Corregidor as well as the underground under American higher commanders. The frontiers of these historic places were manned by Filipino troops and Filipino officers.

It matters not except to us that after the Second World War the Filipino soldier felt disowned by you when you approved the law which provided that service of the soldiers of the Philippine Commonwealth inducted to the U.S. Army shall not be considered service in the U.S. Army for purposes of benefits and rights granted by law.

For the American leaders again listening in a spirit of fairness have openly declared an injustice had been committed and you have sought and are still seeking to right this wrong.

#### KOREA

So the Filipino soldier again died in the battlefields of Korea beside his American comrades for the same cause, while the Republic of the Philippines was fighting its own war of survival against the Huks, the armed elements of communism in my country who had staged their own violent national liberation movement.

#### VIETNAM

And today we send our sons to South Vietnam on an errand of mercy although we face the retaliation of armed communism in our own land in the midst of a financial crisis.

What matters was that you had willingly abided by the true image of America, at once providing in the Philippines a condition of the spirit of freedom: Founding throughout the country a universal educational system; replacing the feudal dispensation of the once regnant Spanish regime with civil institutions; helping the Commonwealth Government in its efforts to implement social and economic reforms, and, finally, introducing into our much-Europeanized culture, the technology, awareness, ideas, and expertise of the vigorous civilization of the new world.

And, as an Asian, may I say that this is precisely what has endeared the civilization of America to Asia. As Tagore had declared, at the turn of the 19th century, it is the modern spirit of Liberalism that makes the West relevant to us.

#### SECOND MESSAGE—VOTE OF THANKS

The second message from the Philippines is a vote of thanks to America.

History recalls that twice in this century America's power, wielded with courage and heroism by the American people, has provided the margin of strength needed to bring world wars to a victorious end. Twice after victory, America shunned the prospect of world domination and turned instead to the tasks of peace.

The Filipino people are thankful that the greatest military power in the world today is also the power most completely

committed to the cause of world peace based on law and justice.

A distinguished historian has predicted that future generations will regard as the noblest achievement of our time, not military or scientific conquests, but the acceptance of international responsibility for the welfare of the entire human family. If this should indeed be the verdict of history, America would be entitled to claim a major share of the credit. For America has pioneered in giving reality to the revolutionary concept that rich nations should help those less fortunate than themselves, not only because it is necessary to do so in today's interdependent world but because it is right.

We in the Philippines are also thankful America has discharged the awesome responsibility of being the first and foremost atomic power in the world with restraint and wisdom. Humanity's safety and its chances for survival rest in the hands of America and we thank God that those strong hands are firmly harnessed to the uses of peace and the heart that moves them entirely worthy of its solemn trust.

#### THIRD MESSAGE

My third message is of greater urgency from the Philippines as well as from all of Asia.

#### THE WALL OF FEAR

As an Asian friend who has read the Asian mind and heart, allow me to speak in candor.

We note some hesitancy, some frustration and doubts in America today.

After you lost the mainland of China to communism, after the battles of Korea and the debacle of Dien Bien Phu, you have doubted your own strength, your own competence, and questioned your own wisdom. Even after the commitment of your sons in Vietnam, still the question is asked: "Where are we headed for?" The mothers ask, "Why must our sons die in some unknown land?"

We condole with you because we too have lost our sons in battle. We too have known the horrors of war. God grant that America will never know what we have known at first hand—Manila was the most ravaged city in the Far East after World War II, and, in the distinguished company of bombed-out shattered cities, was next only to Warsaw.

God grant that America will never see what we saw—an occupation army in full control of city and countryside.

And we know what guerrilla warfare means; we are intimate with its cruel connotations. And we know what it is to die in jungle fastnesses as well as in street corners and alleys—as your young men once knew death in Berlin and Paris, as they are experiencing now in the mud and mire of South Vietnam.

The Philippines is the only country, perhaps, which has overcome a national Communist rebellion with its own indigenous troops—without the aid of alien soldiery. And even today in the Philippines communism again has resurged as a reaction to our increased aid to the Republic of Vietnam.



You who have lost your sons in an unknown land—why such death, you ask? When will these sacrifices end, and what does the future hold for all of us?

These are your questions. Gone for our moment of history is Grotius and his vision of world order. Only you can answer these questions. I can only offer you my thoughts.

You have built around you a wall of fear—the wall of fear of Asia and all things Asian. It is the wall of fear of Asian communism. It is the wall of the unknown, the distant, the unplumbed risks, and the imagined terrors.

For a time Asia cringed in anxiety as there were suggestions that you forfeit your leadership in the Pacific because of fear.

America, the time has not yet come for you to lay down the heavy burden of leadership. Out of the bounty of your human and material resources, this great country has already given more generously to the common fund of human welfare than any other single nation in history. In the lifetime of this generation alone, America has contributed more to the security and well-being of the free world than could ever be repaid by its beneficiaries.

For America by the inscrutable judgment of destiny has become the trustee of civilization for all humanity. And America cannot escape this role.

WE ARE NOT WINNING THE WAR FOR THE MIND  
AND HEART OF ASIA

The summons to America is worldwide, but the area of greatest urgency is my own region, Asia. In Asia today, the issue of world war or world peace hangs in perilous balance. In Asia the future of freedom is being disputed in battlefields as well as in the minds and hearts of men—in the hamlets, the marketplaces. Last year we were losing the military war. Today the tide has turned. The military initiative has transferred to Vietnam and her allies. But we are not winning the war for the mind and heart of Asia. We are in danger of losing it.

In Asia the ultimate questions are being asked concerning man's capacity, in this atomic age, to survive his own suicidal instincts, fashion workable modes of coexistence, and eventually build that better world to which his nobler self aspires.

#### THE THREE CHALLENGES

Asia today challenges America and the rest of the world in three vital fields: security from aggression; economic cooperation; and the definition of the moral and political basis upon which a new, more creative, more stable partnership could be built.

#### VIETNAM

The war in Vietnam agitates the whole world and has brought into sharp focus the problems of Asian security. We stand with America in maintaining that aggression, whether perpetrated openly or by proxy must be deterred and defeated, that all nations, Asian or not, are entitled to freedom from fear of subversion or overt attack, that they should have the period of peace they need to attend unmoled to their urgent tasks of economic and social development.

#### AFTER VIETNAM

But peace or victory in Vietnam is only part of the answer to the question of Asian security. After Vietnam resurgent China poses the bigger problem. Very soon Communist China's growing military power may match its intransigence and its expansionist ambitions. This is the looming menace to Asian and world security today.

If the problem were simply a power equation, it could be solved tomorrow. But at the heart of the matter lies an agonizing dilemma.

#### THE DANGEROUS PERIOD OF A SECURITY GAP

To the free Asian nations rightly belong the primary responsibility for their own security and well-being. This is an inevitable and a welcome consequence of independence. It is a privilege as well as a duty. However, China's power, blatantly militant and still unrestrained by firm commitments to international law, is developing during the dangerous interim period when the other Asian states, whether jointly or alone, cannot organize adequate defensive strength and before the United Nations has perfected its capacity to maintain international peace and order. The resulting security gap invites intervention, subversion, and foreign-inspired "wars of liberation." This dangerous security gap which is the present period can only be filled by America. However much Asian nations may abhor or at best regard with distrust such non-Asian power. It is only American military power that is acceptable in Asia and great enough to deter Communist China's aggressive tendencies.

As an Asian who has made it his life-work to study and know the Asian mind and heart as reflected in the different countries, allow me to remind you that the old hard-core leaders around Mao Tse-tung are firmly and securely in power. The mantle of authority upon the demise of Mao Tse-tung will fall upon the shoulders of Marshal Lin Piao, the prophet of Mao Tse-tung still supported by Chou En-lai. This is a hard political reality. During the lifetime of these leaders at the least, it is believed by many that there is no probability of the moderation or mellowing of Chinese Communist policies. It is felt that Mao Tse-tung's version of protracted war, the war of national liberation, shall be utilized as an instrument of ideological expansion by means of an interminable wave of guerrilla action sustained by ruthless terror.

We are not against negotiations with Red China nor do we espouse a cutting of communications with them. On the contrary, we will support every effort to keep the channels of communication open and hope that negotiation can bring about a suspension of hostilities—but the military initiative just recently recovered should not be forfeited.

#### LIN PIAO'S PATTERN FOR CONQUEST

Marshal Lin Piao's pattern of world conquest is summed up in his terse simplification that in the world Asia, Africa, and Latin America are the rural areas while Western Europe and North America are the cities: That when the rural areas are conquered, the cities will

fall as was their experience in the Chinese mainland.

#### AMERICAN NATIONAL INTEREST

Asia may fall but America is the ultimate target. It is, therefore, to your national interest that the plan be aborted.

#### HOPES FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM

For the past several months, several Asian states, the Philippines among them, have been working quietly and unobtrusively to bring about the first prerequisite to peace in Vietnam and that is to establish lines of communications between North and South Vietnam. The suspension of hostilities in South Vietnam can be attained only by the selfless obsession for anonymity by the negotiators that is required in delicate and sensitive negotiations of this nature.

To bring about peace in Vietnam will involve long, tedious, confidential, and secret negotiations. Patience and fortitude and just the right touch of sophistication and civility in the conduct of these negotiations will succeed. Publicity should come only after peace has been negotiated.

From my point of view it will not matter who will claim the credit for having brought about the successful negotiation. What matters now is that this violent, ruthless, and wasteful war must be brought to the conference table.

The effectivity and success of the quiet type of diplomacy that I propose and advocate has been demonstrated in the dismantling of the confrontations between Indonesia and Malaysia in which the Philippines had a modest share.

Even in this modern world for the success of conciliation the most important factor to regard in Asian diplomacy is that no nation or leader or diplomat loses face in the negotiations. Losing face is still an unpardonable offense to an Asian.

#### AN ASIAN POLITICAL FORUM

Perhaps in this juncture it is now timely to speak frankly of the possibility of an aggrupation of Asian states constituting the ECAFE under the United Nations into a political forum which can defuse or even settle any crisis that may arise in the region.

Such an aggrupation of necessity accepts again the reality of the diversity of ideology among Asian nations. But an aggrupation of like-minded states would of necessity be suspect and be unable to bring about communication between conflicting countries with different ideologies and political beliefs. The establishment of the Asian Development Bank, I hope, will bring the different nations together close enough and condition them to cooperation so that they can hammer out such an arrangement.

#### AMERICAN POWER ON TERMS ACCEPTABLE TO ASIAN NATIONALISM

The crux of the problem for America is to bring American power to bear in Asia on terms acceptable to Asian nationalism. It is a difficult but not an impossible task. Communist China's attacks on Korea, Tibet, and India had alerted neighboring countries to a devel-

oping pattern of expansionist design. The unsuccessful, Communist-inspired coup d'état in Indonesia last year projected this design into the forefront of Asian consciousness. The result was a greatly heightened realization that Communist China, soon to become a nuclear power, has everybody's security problem requiring, for its solution, the cooperation of everyone.

**THE NEW FACTOR—CHINA A COMMON SECURITY PROBLEM TO ALL ASIAN NATIONS: AMERICA'S DETERRENT POWER A NECESSITY**

This new factor in the Asian solution is just beginning to be discerned and has not yet fully developed and cannot be appreciated outside Asia. It is among the most significant and heartening developments in the region in that one of its meaningful aspects is the possible growing desire for regional cooperation not only in the economic and social fields but possibly also in the political and security matters.

Another is the enhanced awareness that for the present and the years immediately ahead, Communist China's neighbors cannot expect, singly or together, to "balance" China's crucial margin of nuclear power without the assistance of non-Asian countries like America. There is in consequence a new disposition to regard America's deterrent power in Asia as a necessity for the duration of time required by the Asian nations to develop their own system of regional security supported by what they hope would have become a greatly strengthened United Nations.

**THE THREE CONDITIONS OF ASIAN COOPERATION**

It is a mood, both realistic and hopeful. Regarded with understanding and consideration, it could offer a wider basis for Asian cooperation than America has been able to achieve in the past. Three conditions are indispensable to the realization of that broader association. It must be based not on the narrow ideological alignments of the cold war but on the inescapable reality of Asian diversity. It must work with the tide of Asian nationalism instead of running counter to it. And it must be constructive in spirit and purpose, looking beyond victory in Vietnam to the creation of a milieu of justice and a rule of law under which all Asian nations could achieve their maximum potential for peaceful growth.

**NOT TOO SOON TO EXPLORE THE POSSIBILITY**

The experience of Vietnam suggests that it is not too soon to explore the creative possibilities of this new approach. To function in Asia without full Asian support is to build on shifting sand. The greater the power projected from outside into Asia, the more compelling the need that it should operate in harmony with Asian aspirations, toward goals compatible with Asian independence and dignity.

**THE CHALLENGES TO AMERICA AND ASIA**

America's deepening appreciation of this need for a genuine basis of understanding and common purpose with Asia coincides with the growing desire in the

region for security from aggression of all kinds, open or disguised, Asian or non-Asian. The challenge to America is to extend to Asia the defensive shield of American power in forms consonant with Asian freedom and self-respect. The challenge to Asia is to discard the dry meatless bone of mysticism and fatalism, for the lifegiving substance of aspiration and endeavor; to leave the past behind, recognize today's need for energetic self-reliance and dignified maturity; to make common cause against aggression, and meet America halfway in a joint undertaking to make the future secure for all.

**AMERICAN DISENGAGEMENT FROM ASIA**

After the United States recognized the independence of the Philippines in 1946, the American Government reluctantly yet realistically accepted the triumph of Communist power in the Chinese mainland as an accomplished fact. Still later, the Allied occupation of Japan, which was essentially an American operation, was formally terminated. All these developments added up to a recognizable policy of American disengagement from the affairs of Asia.

**EUROPE-FIRST POLICY**

In Europe, the trend was exactly the opposite. To the challenge of Soviet power following the end of the Second World War, the United States and its European allies countered with NATO. In rapid succession, the Soviet attempt to drive the Western Allies from West Berlin was deflected by the Berlin airlift, and the Communist threat against Greece and Turkey was nullified by the Truman doctrine. America made it abundantly clear that it was not prepared to see Western Europe overrun by Soviet power.

Thus, American policy in the period after the war conformed more or less to the Europe-first doctrine that had dominated Allied strategy during the war. The Filipino people, who were the main sacrificial victims of that wartime strategy, were deeply concerned that a similar strategic concept would govern the postwar policy of the United States. In 1949, from this same rostrum, President Elpidio Quirino, the second President of the Republic of the Philippines, called upon the United States to respond to the Communist menace in Asia with a Pacific equivalent of NATO. His appeal fell on deaf ears, however, and the following year he was compelled to convoke in Baguio City, on his own responsibility, and without American support, the first Conference of Southeast Asia.

**KOREA—THE U.N.**

Within months after the holding of the Baguio Conference, the Communists struck in Korea. President Truman, who had firmly challenged Communist ambitions in Europe while acquiescing to a policy of disengagement from Asia, suddenly realized that Communist power was reaching out boldly toward Asia. Under the banner of the United Nations, the United States and 15 other States, including the Philippines, joined forces to

repel the Communist invasion of South Korea.

**THE SEATO**

Out of the bitter experience of the war in Korea, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization—SEATO—was born. This happened in Manila in 1954, 4 years after President Quirino had first advocated the establishment of an anti-Communist alliance to serve as the Asian equivalent of NATO. At the same time, the United States entered into mutual defense alliances with the Philippines, Japan, Australia, and New Zealand. All these things were done under the much-scorned but now surprisingly topical Dulles doctrine of "brinkmanship" and "massive retaliation."

**THE SALIENT ELEMENTS OF AMERICAN POLICY**

The salient elements of American policy emerge from this brief recital of recent events. The first is that, following the end of the Second World War, there was a deliberate attempt to orient American policy away from Asia and the Pacific toward Europe and the Atlantic. The second is that American policy in Asia has been essentially passive in character, developed and pursued mainly in response to Communist initiatives in subversion, aggression, and conquest. In short, the United States has been a reluctant participant in the affairs of Asia.

**UNLIMITED COMMITMENT IN EUROPE, LIMITED COMMITMENT IN ASIA**

That reluctance did not spring from a new spirit of isolationism among the American people: It sprang rather from the feeling that prevailed among the makers of American foreign policy at the time that while the United States could undertake a virtually unlimited commitment to defend Europe, it could only accept a limited commitment to defend Asia. This was duly reflected in the differing obligations accepted by the United States under NATO and SEATO. American awareness of closer racial and cultural affinities with Europe probably justified this attitude in a situation where American power was, in any case, inadequate to police the world as a whole.

**VIETNAM JUSTIFIED NEITHER BY AFFINITY NOR U.N. KOREA EXAMPLE**

Today, we face the fact of massive American involvement in Vietnam—in a struggle which can neither be explained on the basis of recognized affinities nor justified by the example of the previous United Nations action in Korea.

**HISTORY—UNITED STATES WAS FIRST PACIFIC POWER BEFORE IT WAS AN ATLANTIC POWER**

History, however, may provide both explanation and justification. One elementary fact of American history is that the United States was a Pacific power long before it became an Atlantic power. President Washington's injunctions against "entangling alliances" and President Monroe's promulgation of the doctrine that bears his name insured America's virtual isolation from European affairs. This isolation lasted a long time, and America did not become an Atlantic power until after the First World War.



COMMODORE PERRY AND JAPAN, PHILIPPINES  
HAWAII, AND ALASKA

By contrast, the United States became a Pacific power just before the Civil War, when Commodore Perry opened feudal Japan to the modern world. This was followed at the turn of the last century by the acquisition of the Philippines, Hawaii, and Alaska, and by American support of the open door policy in China. American rule over the Philippines, the war in the Pacific, and the American occupation of Japan confirmed and strengthened the status of the United States as a Pacific power.

The American presence in Vietnam makes sense only when viewed in the historical context of the development of the United States as a Pacific power.

To recall this chapter of American history is not, of course, necessarily to justify the motives that brought the United States to Asia. The truth is that the American Republic, having isolated itself from the affairs of Europe and having had no share in the spoliation of Africa, was obliged to turn to Asia, across the Pacific as the object of its belated imperialist attentions.

NO MORE IMPERIALIST AMBITIONS IN ASIA

Today, having relinquished control of the Philippines and terminated the occupation of Japan, the United States can truthfully disavow any surviving imperialist ambitions in Asia. The presence of American bases and American troops in South Korea, Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines could be justified as aiming solely to deter or repel any encroachments of Communist power in these areas.

REPEAT THE AVOWALS

This point should be made indubitably clear in the case of the American presence in Vietnam. Americans and their Government should never tire repeating that the United States is in Vietnam for the purpose of assisting that nation in defending its independence and territorial integrity. They should give every assurance that they are not in Vietnam, or anywhere else in Asia, for the purpose of political hegemony or economic gain. This, President Johnson has repeatedly done.

Such avowals of American purpose would correspond to the deepest aspirations of the non-Communist Asian nations themselves. Their common hope and desire is to be given an opportunity to consolidate their independence, to translate it in terms of a better life for their citizens, to determine and shape the destiny of their country without outside interference of any kind. To achieve these goals, these non-Communist nations realize that they need the umbrella of American power to shield them from Communist infiltration, subversion, and aggression. Without attempting to establish new or enlarged military alliances, it should be possible for the United States to provide this protection for all those nations that desire and ask for it.

DOES AMERICA HAVE A NEGATIVE RECORD IN  
FOREIGN AFFAIRS?

Does America have a "negative" record in foreign affairs? The record shows

that the East-West confrontation in Europe has been stabilized and that Communist influence is in retreat in Asia and Africa. As late as 2 years ago, non-alignment or Communist-leaning neutralism was the prevailing policy among Asian states. Today, Ceylon, India, and Indonesia have virtually abandoned their old, familiar stance of neutralism and become firmly anti-Communist. Pakistan appears to be desisting from its open flirtation with Communist China, while the Communist Parties of North Korea and Japan have declared their independence of Peking.

BENEFITS FROM AMERICAN PRESENCE

I personally know for a fact that the American presence in Vietnam provided—though quite unintentionally—encouragement and support to those who successfully resisted the attempted Communist takeover in Indonesia. It is certain that the U.S. 7th Fleet in the China Sea as well as American airpower in the area rendered inoperative the so-called Peking-Djakarta axis which the Indonesian Communist Party might otherwise have invoked in the extremity of its disastrous debacle in Java.

In effect, and almost without realizing it, we are even now already reaping valuable dividends from the American presence in Vietnam. Those benefits are certain to multiply as the non-Communist neighbors of China understand that their security is guaranteed by the umbrella of American power. The assurance that has been given by President Johnson that this protection will not suddenly be withdrawn tomorrow, thus leaving them to the mercy of Chinese communism, is an indispensable factor in maintaining the stability of southeast Asia.

DOMINO THEORY

The so-called domino theory which many experts tend to discount, may be an oversimplification. But it is certainly correct to argue that a country like Thailand, for example, is hardly likely to depend for its security on an American Army that has been defeated or has withdrawn under fire from Vietnam. Thailand would have to adjust to Chinese hegemony in Asia and its attitude would be shared in varying degrees by Laos, Malaysia, India, Pakistan, Japan, and the Philippines.

OBJECT—"CORDON SANITAIRE"

Our object must be to hold the line in Vietnam and, at least, to roll back Communist power behind the 17th parallel. This being achieved, we shall have provided a necessary basis for joint action among the southeast Asia nations themselves in order to insure their collective security.

When this has been done, American military power could withdraw to existing bases in the outlying islands and archipelagos: Japan, Okinawa, Taiwan, and the Philippines. Together with the U.S. 7th Fleet, this line of defense off the Asian mainland could be rendered completely impregnable, while offering needed support to any mainland nation that may be threatened by Communist power.

With this "cordon sanitaire" effectively established around the eastern and southern flanks of Communist China, the latter might then realize that it could more usefully harness its energies to the enormous task of satisfying the needs and improving the livelihood of its 700 million people. Or it could turn around and begin looking over and across the 5,000-mile front which it shares with the Soviet Union. But that would be another story.

There was reason to say in mitigation of Communist China's avowed policy of universal revolution, that is, of abetting and assisting "people's wars" abroad, that while the rulers of Peking are violent in their speeches, they are remarkably nonviolent in their actions. In recent weeks, however, many of the statements of the Chinese Communist leaders as well as some of the actions which they have tolerated or encouraged, appear to verge dangerously on the irrational. Prudence dictates that we should beware lest the fanaticism behind their words translates itself into fanatical action, and lest their irrationality in domestic matters merely foreshadows irrationality in foreign affairs.

No Asian country or government desires the destruction of Communist China. We who are its neighbors realize that we must coexist with China and the Chinese people. We need to adjust to the overwhelming fact that it exists in our very midst. But, equally, Communist China must accept the obligation to coexist peacefully with its neighbors. This means that it must abandon and forswear its policy of exporting violence and fomenting disorder amongst its neighbors.

Until we receive assurances to this end, the policy of the military containment of China must continue.

WINSTON CHURCHILL ON GREATNESS

It was Winston Churchill who said, as he rallied the battle-weary people of Britain during the last war, that the true measure of a nation's greatness is what it can do when it is tired. On the basis of this criterion, the United States may not, because of divided counsel at home, because of increasing fatigue from endless responsibility, or because of impatience with difficult allies, lay down the heavy burden of power and, in effect, resign as the leader-nation of the free world.

It is not easy for someone not an American to say these things to Americans at a most trying moment in their history. It would behoove an outsider to keep discreet silence on questions that have so deeply divided Americans. Having served in the U.S. Armed Forces during World War II and as a guerrilla officer during the Japanese occupation, I cannot be indifferent to the grief of thousands of Americans and Vietnamese whose brothers, sons, and husbands are fighting and dying in Vietnam.

Though I have spoken of our stake in Vietnam in terms of a battle of ideologies and a contest for power, I do not forget that the values involved in that struggle are profoundly human. Because the stakes are high, even decisive, involving the very future of freedom in

Asia and, ultimately, in the world as a whole, including this country, we should like to see the hand of America remain steady and sure on the wheel of power and responsibility. We should like to be reassured that this great country, its people and Government, shall never act upon the agonizing issues of our time in disgust or anger, or from a feeling of tiredness or a sense of panic, but in the knowledge that they are confronted with responsibilities that must be met, tasks that must be accomplished, and battles that must be waged with all the courage and wisdom at their command.

#### THE PARALLEL IN THE ECONOMIC FIELD—MAXIMUM SELF-HELP AND THE ECONOMIC DEFICIENCY

A parallel situation obtains in the economic field. Here, too, the primary responsibility rests with the Asian countries themselves. Economic and social development on a scale commensurate with the aroused expectations of their own people is a task deserving of their greatest effort and utmost dedication. Maximum self-help should be their watchword dictated as much by self-respect as by sheer necessity. But here, too, even heroic national exertions may yet leave between success and failure, between poverty and prosperity, a vital margin—the economic gap which only assistance from outside can fill at this stage. And as in the field of security, foreign aid, though needed and desired, must be extended without the harsh demands that remind Asia of its past enslavement and with some sophistication if not idealism, in ways compatible with Asian nationalism.

#### THE LINKS OF ECONOMICS TO SECURITY

The links of economics with the problem of peace are less obvious but no less real. Poverty is not only a fertile seedbed for Communist dictatorship and other extreme solutions; it is also the open gate to foreign-inspired subversion and the open road to "wars of national liberation." When it afflicts a region as vast and as populous as Asia, it becomes a major threat to world peace.

#### ASIA AND THE DREADFUL POTENTIAL OF TRIGGERING A WORLD WAR

One-half of mankind living in abject want or at bare subsistence levels constitute an enormous drag on world prosperity. Itself already a "sea of troubles," impoverished Asia also has the more dreadful potential of triggering another World War, offering as it does an almost irresistible temptation for foreign intervention. And in the growing economic bipolarization of the world into rich nations becoming richer and poor nations becoming poorer—one of the most serious long-term threats to international security—Asia with its population explosion, its unsatisfied wants, and its deeply rooted grievances against the past, would be a major factor for all of humanity.

Much is already being done through existing organizations, within as well as outside the United Nations, to meet Asia's need for economic aid. More is required to fill that vital margin between failure and success which even the most devoted application of self-help cannot

bridge. Increased capital investments and more effective technical assistance are essential. But more important in the long run is the enhancement of the feeling of partnership between the nations giving aid and the nations receiving it.

#### THE MORAL BASIS OF ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

Precisely because there is no shortcut to economic development, the human factor should be kept constantly in view. The moral basis of economic assistance should never be forgotten in the preoccupation with its material superstructure. A sense of joint involvement in one of the great enterprises of this century is needed to sustain both the rich and the poor nations during the long, difficult journey toward the goal of a better life for all envisaged by the United Nations Charter.

#### THE MORAL ASPECT OF PARTICULAR RELEVANCE TO ASIA

The moral aspect of economic cooperation is of particular relevance to Asia. The nations of Asia give high priority to economic progress. But their deepest hunger is not of the body; it is a hunger of the spirit: the desire, after centuries of colonial bondage, for the fullest attainable measure of human equality and human dignity.

#### THE LONGINGS OF ASIA

This is the reason why the American Declaration of Independence still transmits a living message to the peoples of Asia, why they hold Lincoln the emancipator in such high regard, and why they have been so deeply moved by Roosevelt's proclamation of the four freedoms, Kennedy's ringing summons to a global alliance for the upliftment of the human condition throughout the world; and that is why President Johnson is called the liberator of Asia with his solemn promise of military security and his challenge to a social revolution.

#### THEY MISJUDGE ASIA

They misjudge Asia who believe that the material factor will be decisive for Asia's future. And they malign Asia who imagine that Asian nations are craven opportunists, intimidated by brute strength and ever ready to join the winning side. America's Philippine experience belies both beliefs. And if an Asian leader were to be asked to choose between indignity and hunger, he would unhesitatingly choose hunger. And his people would go hungry with him.

#### ASIA IS AN ANCIENT CIVILIZATION

For Asia is an ancient civilization; and its culture is essentially shaped by philosophy and religion and its actions moved by its ethical precepts. And when we react to the West, it is its materialism, its scientific power that we confront and the signs of enervation of its spirit. We discover a prosperous society, advanced in its technology and living by the fundamentals of power and the machine and by its material excesses.

But even here we perceive the fact of conflict arising from the inability of peoples to accommodate the yearnings of purely human values to be projected in this materialistic culture. And indeed in our world, we witness not merely total war but also the acceptance of the total-

ization of doom. Beneath the overt unresolved conflicts of nations is the reality of human conflict—man against his culture because it has not been able to accommodate entirely his values and even man against himself.

#### THE HUMAN CONDITION IS A DIALECTIC

The human condition is a dialectic and man himself has forfeited the inner harmony of his own nature.

Between the conceptions and actions of our civilization is a great divide of discordant facts. We have a politics, for instance, openly declared on democratic principles, but we witness the reality of inequality in our times; the fact of the subversion of the self-determination of nations; the disintegration of international law itself because of the inability of nations and powers in the international community to live by the postulates of the rule of law. The system of Grotius and the efforts of internationalists to enlist reason and an ordered postulate of justice in the settlement of disputes have found no concrete actuality.

And yet, it cannot be denied that in our century the evidence of material advancement and the prosperity of peoples is more true than at any other period of human history. The conclusion, therefore, is undeniable: that man cannot be sustained by the actuality of materialism; that he does not live by bread alone, and that it is only when wealth identifies itself with the spirit that it justifies itself.

#### AMERICAN LEADERSHIP NOT ONLY MILITARY BUT SPIRITUAL

American leadership has never been solely military; more accurately, it has consistently been spiritual.

#### THE MARSHALL PLAN, AND SO FORTH

Your Marshall plan to a devastated Europe; your corps of peace volunteers to Africa and Asia; your concern with the democratic rehabilitation of Japan, an enemy country, even your economic aid to developing societies, and your readiness to come to the defense of nations beleaguered in their just fight for sovereign rights—this is not America, the military imperialist, but the same America which saw in the conditions of the Philippines, my country, the prospect for a democratic experiment in Asia, the dismantling of the colonial machinery that was to end the enslavement of many peoples of the world.

In Vietnam are the savagery and ferocity, the treachery and bloodiness of war. Yet, there America has identified itself with individual fulfillment, with freedom, with nobility of the soul, with social justice.

For all the iron and steel you have piled on solid ground, Vietnam remains a vision and spirit which posterity, given the perspective of time, will be able to judge in its true light.

#### THE RELEVANCE OF REASSERTION OF AMERICAN LEADERSHIP

There is, therefore, the relevance of a reassertion of American leadership—a leadership based on the concepts of this new society as it was defined by your Founding Fathers and reiterated in the American Declaration of Independence—a leadership that is bold and vigorous in



its liberalism, cutting across the distances between peoples which were created by misunderstanding, ignorance, and differences of human conditions and, just as your Founding Fathers had ventured out to the open seas so much feared for their imaginary terrors and false depths of risks, let America once more break through the wall of fear of Asia which has kept peoples apart and nations divided.

#### THE AMERICA ENSHRINED

This is the America which the old world had enshrined in its liberalism; the new society which immediately found acceptance from the disenchanted nations of Europe and Asia at the turn of the 19th century—the image of the new world that had bewitched Dutch sailors' eyes and the migrating vision of those who took flight from the tyranny of monarchies—the green light of the 20th century that has heretofore been a beacon of the lost ideals of our times.

This is what has ennobled the image of America.

#### HOW CAN AMERICA REACH THE HEART OF ASIA?

To those who ask how America can reach the heart of Asia, I say: let America speak from the depths of its own heart: with the voice of Jefferson, with the compassion of Lincoln, with the vision of Roosevelt, with Kennedy's clarion call to a crusade in behalf of the weak, the oppressed, and defenseless; for a world of hope, lawful order, and growing freedom; let America speak through President Johnson's challenge for the social revolution that would transform human society without violence to human rights.

America, speak to Asia in the words of President Johnson when he said:

By peace in Asia I do not mean simply the absence of armed hostilities. For where men hunger and hate, there can be no peace.

I do not mean that peace of conquest. For humiliation can be the seedbed of war.

And I do not mean simply the peace of the conference table. For peace is not written merely in the words of treaties, but in the day-by-day works of builders.

The peace we seek in Asia is a peace of conciliation: between Communist States and their non-Communist neighbors; between rich nations and poor; between small nations and large; between men whose skins are brown and black and yellow and white; between Hindus and Moslems and Buddhists and Christians.

It is a peace that can only be sustained through the durable bonds of peace: through international trade; through the free flow of people and ideas; through full participation by all nations in an international community under law; and through a common dedication to the great tasks of human progress and economic development. Is such a peace possible?

With all my heart, I believe it is. We are not there yet. We have a long way to journey.

Addressed in these accents, Asia will listen. Confronted with this challenge, Asia will respond.

#### LAST MESSAGE

My last message to you is hard for me to articulate.

Let me bare my heart to you. I have come not as an enemy. I have contributed my modest share in the payment of

the price for the liberties and ideals which we all cherish.

It is precisely because of this that I have been hounded by loud persistent criticisms that I am much too pro-American in my policies. Perhaps I am—emotionally so. For I was one of the many who gambled everything—life, dreams, and honor—on a faith in and the vision of America, when all was lost as the Stars and Stripes for the first time in history was trodden to the ground in Asia. I have faith in your objectives in Asia and am deeply convinced that democracy such as ours in the Philippines can thrive in an ocean of neutrals and Communists but only if you keep true to and abide by the image of fairness that is America.

And the truth is all of Asia watches how America will treat her most loyal and steadfast ally. The whole world watches if America will mete out justice to the Filipino veterans. There are rumblings among my people. Far too many of them, including some of our intellectual leaders, have long ago lost faith in your sense of fairness. Without necessarily heeding the importunings of our Communist enemies, they are harsh critics and have given up hope of American justice. They claim American policy desires only the permanence or predominance of American power in Asia regardless of what happens to the individual Asian and that you could not care less who lost his head to the tyrant provided that tyrant was your tyrant. They cry "American help is self-help; America is a friend in need, her need."

And it is paradoxical that after the Second World War we have had to endure American ridicule for our claims to equal rights under the veterans laws of this country. We are unprepared for the rebuffs that we received but even less prepared for the hostility in the attitudes of some of your executive officials who have had to deal with us. Our former common enemy, Japan, had been patient and understanding. From you, our Allies, we expected nothing less. But we did not get it.

Sometimes I have stood alone or with a few loyal comrades as of old, beleaguered by a sea of opposition as I reaffirmed loyalty to the American image.

So, upon the kind invitation of your great President, I have come to you with leave of my people. When I sought their counsel, they told me: "Go, young man of many dreams and many scars, go to your friends. Go but once and no more." I can hear them say still: "Go with our misgivings for we know only too well the Americans' disdain for state visitors who go to their land with promises of loyalty to their ideals and global objectives but with their palms and hands stretched out for aid. Do not beg for alms or aid for we do not solicit charity.

"But tell them loyalty is not for sale. There is no price tag for faith except justice.

"Go and tell them this. If, after they have heard you, they remain unmoved, then with sorrow and grief tell them we are prepared to close this unfortunate chapter of Philippine-American history. With dignity, the Philippines shall stand alone as we have done in the past, fight-

ing off the terrors of our enemies. If we are overwhelmed, then Asia is lost to communism but we would have had our share of conflict. And if we fall, we shall have fallen with pride and shall have died with honor."

But the critics were more cruel. And even the veterans scoff at our own scars in battle. One of these scars I received in trying to save an American comrade. "Where is he now?" they ask. "He is dead like many of our dreams."

Yes, my American comrade died in my arms. We were surrounded and we had to break out. He fell and, as he tried to crawl to safety, I returned to him, to fall at his side—Filipino and American blood commingling in Philippine soil.

As I cradled him in my arms to a fox-hole, he died with the words: "Tell them back home, you who will live, my only regret in dying is that America has failed us."

I, the Filipino, assured the American, as if this would assuage his dying, "No, America does not forget and will not fail us."

Many years are past. Time should have muted the tone of confidence and the tyranny of circumstance should have eroded the memory but still today, I say to you as I have said to my people: "America does not forget. America will not fail us."

At 1 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m., the President of the Republic of the Philippines, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper, Hon. William M. Miller, escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order: The members of the President's Cabinet, the ambassadors, ministers, and charges d'affaires of foreign governments.

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses hereby dissolved.

Accordingly, at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m., the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

#### PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS TO BE PRINTED

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in

order under the Calendar Wednesday rule for next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] the program for the remainder of this week and the program for next week.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is intended to seek unanimous consent to go over from adjournment today until next Monday.

Mr. Speaker, the program for next week is as follows:

On Monday we will have the call of the Consent Calendar.

There are 12 suspensions which are as follows:

H.R. 8678, Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore, Mich.;

H.R. 17488, Veterans' Pension Act of 1966;

H.R. 16557, relating to national service life insurance issued to military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines;

H.R. 15183, adjusting the status of Cuban refugees to that of lawful permanent residents of the United States;

S. 3510, Connecticut River National Recreation Area;

H.R. 16715, Manpower Development and Training Amendments, 1966;

House Joint Resolution 1169, International Conference on Water for Peace;

S. 3423, Wolf Trap Farm Park, Fairfax County, Va.;

S. 2287, authorizing a 5-year hydrologic study and investigation of the Delmarva Peninsula;

H.R. 14136, authorizing increase in fee for migratory bird hunting stamp;

S. 1474, creating a bipartisan commission to study Federal laws limiting political activity by officers and employees of Government; and

S. 3035, establishing a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week the program is as follows:

There will be the call of the Private Calendar.

Also—

H.R. 17788, Foreign Assistance Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1967;

H.R. 17787, Public Works Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1967;

H.R. 17195, Reserve Forces Bill of Rights and Vitalization Act of 1966—open rule, 2 hours' debate;

H.R. 14604, Authorizing study for a Capitol Visitors' Center—open rule, 1 hour debate; and

H.R. 11555, the Chamizal Memorial Highway—open rule, 1 hour debate.

And, Mr. Speaker, of course, conference reports may be in order at any time and any additions to the legislative program may be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman will yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from California, the acting majority leader, could give us any information this week as to the possibility of sine die adjournment?

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] will yield further, I would refer the gentleman to the fond hope which I have expressed in response to a similar inquiry just a week ago.

Mr. GROSS. I like fond hopes but I cannot do very much planning on a basis of fond hopes.

Mr. MOSS. We share a common dilemma.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the gentleman next week, when he announces the program, will be prepared to give us some idea of when we might expect to go to a sine die adjournment, or at least a recess, or whatever is planned for us.

Mr. MOSS. I assure the gentleman that I share that hope.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO SEPTEMBER 19, 1966

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss]?

There was no objection.

#### PROVIDING SPECIAL ALLOWANCES TO DEPENDENTS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES TO OFFSET EXPENSES INCURRED IN EMERGENCY EVACUATIONS

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 11979) to make permanent the act of May 22, 1965, authorizing the payment of special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services to offset expenses incident to their evacuation, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out "striking out", and terminates on June 30, 1966." and insert "striking out 'June 30, 1966' and substituting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1971'."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to extend the authority for the payment of spe-

cial allowances to evacuated dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, tell the membership what the Senate amendments are to the House version?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. If the gentleman will yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The bill which the House passed was passed as permanent legislation. The Senate limited it to 5 years so that we may have another review. We felt that this was not a bad idea and accepted their proposal. This will give us a chance to review it after 5 years and we decided, after consultation with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], to accept the amendments.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REMOVING INEQUITIES IN THE ACTIVE DUTY PROMOTION OPPORTUNITIES OF CERTAIN OFFICERS

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 15005) to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove inequities in the active duty promotion opportunities of certain officers, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, beginning with the date of enactment of this Act through June 30, 1972, the columns under the headings 'For colonels' and 'For lieutenant colonels' contained in the table in section 8202(a) of title 10, United States Code, are suspended. For such period such columns shall read as follows:

"For colonels	For lieutenant colonels
3,500	6,500
3,859	7,706
4,218	8,911
4,577	10,116
4,936	11,321
5,295	12,527
5,654	13,732
6,013	14,937
6,372	16,142
6,730	17,348
7,089	18,553
7,449	19,758
7,807	20,963
8,166	22,169



"SEC. 2. For a period of six years after the effective date of this Act, the authorized strengths prescribed by section 8202 of title 10, United States Code, may be exceeded (1) by 1,000 for the grade of lieutenant colonel; and (2) by the following numbers for the grade of major:

	Number to exceed authorized strength
"Fiscal years following enactment: First -----	9,500
Second -----	7,917
Third -----	6,334
Fourth -----	4,751
Fifth -----	3,163
Sixth -----	1,585

"However, the authority to exceed the authorized strengths by 1,000 for the grade of lieutenant colonel, and 1,500 for the grade of major authorized by this section may be used only in the event that drastic reductions or increases in the authorized strength of the commissioned officers on active duty in the Air Force occur within a short period of time and that such changes seriously impede promotions to the grade of major and lieutenant colonel as determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, who shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives not later than 60 days following the utilization of any of the numbers covered in this sentence."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend title 10, United States Code, to increase the authorized numbers for the grade of major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel in the Air Force in order to provide active duty promotion opportunities for certain officers, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services inform the House what the Senate amendments are?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this bill passed the House unanimously.

Almost every year we have to pass an act with reference to increasing the number of Air Force officers serving on active duty in the grades of lieutenant colonel and colonel with a resultant increase in the number of Air Force officers in lesser grades who may be promoted.

The purpose of the House bill, therefore, was to permanently provide Air Force officers with generally the same promotion opportunities as is provided in other branches of the service.

The Senate amendment concurs in the House action. However, rather than making this authority permanent, as the other services are, the Senate amendment provides that the increased authorization to the Air Force officers serving in the various grades would only go until June 30, 1972.

The Senate action will, therefore, accomplish the purpose and objective of the House-passed bill with, however, the additional requirement that Congress will be required to act once again on this problem in 1972 rather than having it permanent, and we accepted the amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Do you mean that the promotions would be rescinded after the end of the temporary period?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. No, just the authority to exceed the legal limit expired. Almost every year we bring up a bill of this nature and we felt we would obviate that necessity by making it permanent. The other body did not agree with our view.

Mr. GROSS. The temporary nature of the bill is due to the fact that the other body wants to make a study of the entire promotion system throughout the military.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. That is what they say they want to do, and we would like to see that done. We have urged this. We have agreed to the year 1972, but we would like to see it permanent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF CEREMONY UNVEILING PORTRAIT OF SPEAKER SAM RAYBURN

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to invite my distinguished colleagues of the House to a ceremony when we will pause once more to pay tribute to that great American, the late Speaker Sam Rayburn.

At 11 o'clock a.m., tomorrow, Friday, September 16, the 26th anniversary of Mr. Sam's first election as Speaker of this House, a portrait of him will be presented. This ceremony is being held in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee room of the Rayburn Building.

This lovely portrait is the work of that noted Texas artist, Tom Lea, of El Paso.

The entire Sam Rayburn Portrait Committee composed of Judge R. Ewing Thomason, the Honorable Frank Akard, Judge Eugene Worley, Judge Paul Kilday, and myself, and speaking not only for those of us who have the current pleasure of representing the people of the great State of Texas in this House, but also many of those former Texas Congressmen who were honored to serve side by side with Speaker Rayburn, we welcome you to join us on this momentous occasion.

#### EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS FROM EXAMINATION-OF-RECORDS CLAUSE

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 3041), to amend title 10, United States Code, to exempt

certain contracts with foreign contractors from the requirement for an examination-of-records clause, with the Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 16 to 20, inclusive, and insert "Comptroller General or his designee is not required—

"(1) where the contractor or subcontractor is a foreign government or agency thereof or is precluded by the laws of the country involved from making its books, documents, papers, or records available for examination; and

"(2) where the head of the agency determines, after taking into account the price and availability of the property or services from United States sources, that the public interest would be best served by not applying subsection (b).

If subsection (b) is not applied to a contract or subcontract based on a determination under clause (2), a written report shall be furnished to the Congress."

Page 3, strike out lines 8 to 14, inclusive, and insert "for the omission of such clause—

"(1) where the contractor or subcontractor is a foreign government or agency thereof or is precluded by the laws of the country involved from making its books, documents, papers, or records available for examination; and

"(2) where the agency head determines, after taking into account the price and availability of the property or services from United States sources, that the public interest would be best served by the omission of the clause.

If the clause is omitted based on a determination under clause (2) a written report shall be furnished to the Congress. The power of the agency head to make the determination specified in the preceding sentences shall not be delegable."

Page 3, strike out all after line 24 over to and including line 4 on page 4 and insert "not required for the omission of such clause—

"(1) where the contractor or subcontractor is a foreign government or agency thereof or is precluded by the laws of the country involved from making its books, documents, papers, or records available for examination; and

"(2) where the agency head determines, after taking into account the price and availability of the property or services from United States sources, that the public interest would be best served by the omission of the clause.

If the clause is omitted based on a determination under clause (2), a written report shall be furnished to the Congress."

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3041 passed the House on the Consent Calendar on August 16, 1965. On September 1 of this year, the Senate passed the bill with amendments.

Under the bill, the head of an agency could exclude the examination-of-records clause from a contract or subcontract with a foreign contractor or foreign subcontractor. Before the clause could be excluded, the agency head must determine that inclusion of the clause

would not be in the public interest, and the Comptroller General, or his designee, would have to concur in this determination. Moreover, this finding must be in writing and it must clearly indicate why the requirement for an examination-of-records clause would not be in the public interest.

The concurrence of the Comptroller General or his designee would not be required where the contractor or subcontractor is a foreign government or an agency thereof, or where the laws of the country involved preclude the contractor from making his books, documents, papers, or records available for examination.

The Senate adopted amendments providing that in those cases where the concurrence of the Comptroller General is not required before the examination-of-records clause can be excluded, the head of the agency must take into account the price and availability of the supplies or services from U.S. sources before determining that inclusion of the examination-of-records clause would not be in the public interest. In addition, the Congress must be furnished a report explaining the reasons for any such determinations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSALS FOR COMBATING INFLATION

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has sent to us several recommendations which he believes will assure the continuing health of our economy. I believe that we should act on these recommendations promptly and affirmatively, for I share both the President's sense of urgency and his conviction that these are the appropriate measures to take at this time.

The progress made by the American economy during the last 5½ years has been the envy of the world. It is unparalleled in history. We have more production, better wages, higher profits, and more employment than ever before. We also have the dangers which go with prosperity. We must exercise every care if we are to avoid a runaway inflation followed by the inevitable boom and bust.

As the Members know, we have been acting to safeguard our prosperity since the beginning of this year. By such measures as the increased payroll taxes for social security, the restored excise taxes, and the speedup in corporate tax payments, we have succeeded in removing about \$10 billion of purchasing power from the economy. We have held down Federal spending. As the President also

points out, since January 1 of this year, we have taken in more money than we have spent. Rising prices and the shortage of both labor and money in critical areas make it quite clear, however, that we still have not done enough.

The President, therefore, proposes to take strong measures to reduce and defer Federal expenditures. He asks for cooperation from the Congress in holding down appropriations, and I urge that we give him that cooperation.

He recommends that the 7-percent investment tax credit be made inoperative from September 1, 1966, until January 1968. I believe we should accede to that request. The investment credit was devised to stimulate investment in plant and equipment, and it has succeeded magnificently. In fact, it has succeeded too well and neither industry nor the money markets can keep pace with the demand. This is the source of much of our problem; the least we should do is to suspend the bonus which encourages excess expansion.

The President has also recommended that we suspend the accelerated depreciation on buildings and structures for the same length of time, and for the same reason. Accelerated depreciation allowances encourage the construction of commercial and industrial buildings just as investment tax credit stimulates machinery and equipment outlays. In the present state of our economy, the effect is to contribute to inflated building costs and inflated interest rates.

The President has also urged the Federal Reserve Board and our commercial banks to lower interest rates. The present high rates have not succeeded in slowing down the type of economic activity which is causing most of the difficulty, but it has succeeded in penalizing very large segments of our industry and commerce and placing a growing burden on the shoulders of millions of families.

I believe that the policies outlined in the President's message will contribute to a better balanced, more equitable set of economic restraints. I believe the actions he proposes for the Executive should be applauded. And I believe that the requests and the recommendations he makes to the Congress should be promptly honored.

#### THE BATTLE OF LAKE ERIE

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, September 10, marked the anniversary of one of our Nation's greatest military victories. It is unfortunate that so many Americans let September 10 pass unnoticed.

Saturday marked the 153d anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie, which has captured the imagination of naval scholars and American patriots for generations.

The American victory gave control of the Great Lakes to the United States, a vitally important matter in the War of 1812. The victory made certain that the huge territory now made up of the western part of Pennsylvania, northern Ohio, northern Indiana, northern Illinois, and all of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota would be part of the United States, not Canada.

In the Battle of Lake Erie, Oliver Hazard Perry became one of America's most famous heroes. Perry's flagship, the *Lawrence*, was subjected to the concentrated fire of the enemy. First one gun and then another was dismounted. The masts were broken. The rigging of the vessel was rent away. The sails were torn to shreds. The *Lawrence* lay helpless in the water.

On deck American sailors lay dead and dying. During the 2½ hours that Perry faced his British antagonists, his men were reduced to a handful. Entering the action, the *Lawrence* had had more than a hundred men and officers. By the afternoon of September 10, 1813, 83 of these were either dead or wounded.

Yet still Perry held out. Soon only the commander and 13 others remained uninjured. All the ships of his fleet were now engaged. Perry now pulled down his battle flag, but left the Stars and Stripes still flying. With four of his seamen, he removed his battle flag and pennant to a boat, in which, under heavy fire, they rowed to the vessel *Niagara*, fighting more than a half mile away.

Now Perry gave the order to swoop down upon the enemy's line. He cut the British fleet's formation in two. Thirty minutes of broadside after broadside and all was over.

The British commander, Barclay, soon surrendered. There were 40 dead in his squadron, and 94, including himself, were wounded. The American casualties were 27 killed and 96 wounded.

From his ship, the *Lawrence*, to which he had returned to receive the formal surrender of the British, Perry sent his famous message to Gen. William Henry Harrison, the commander of the American Army in the Northwest: "We have met the enemy, and they are ours."

This stunning victory of the non-descript American fleet under Perry off Lake Erie's Put-In-Bay was the major naval engagement on the Great Lakes in the War of 1812. It insured American control of Lake Erie. The American Northwest was secured forever free from British power.

Today, on the lakefront at Erie, stands Perry's historic flagship, the *Niagara*. Proud and tall, it stands as a symbol of American heroism, of American determination to forever fight for what is right, forever fight to be free. Let us emulate those qualities which Oliver Hazard Perry and his brave men so ably demonstrated on September 10, 1813.

#### AMERICAN LEGION COMMENDS TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include a resolution.



The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, all of us know about the serious and commendable work which the American Legion accomplishes each year at its annual national convention. While studying the resolutions relating to national security adopted by this year's national convention held here in Washington, I was most impressed by the timeliness of one of the resolutions which commended the Tactical Air Command for its reaction in the present emergency.

We have warm praise for the U.S. Army, the U.S. Navy, the U.S. Marine Corps, the U.S. Coast Guard, and our gallant allies for their efforts in Vietnam. We believe that their professional attainments in the present conflict will stand high in the annals of warfare. But we think that the Tactical Air Command deserves special praise, for this important arm has not always received deserved attention in past years when dollars were short. TAC came into the present emergency with much of its equipment out of date and its strength in aircraft and personnel minimal. According to figures released by the Office of the Secretary of Defense the United States has lost 477 tactical airplanes in North and South Vietnam, and the gallant performance of the men and crews deserves our highest praise and greatest appreciation. We agree with the American Legion in commending the Tactical Air Command.

Our Secretary of Defense has brought startling efficiencies to the management of our armed services. We often hear that exploitation of computer techniques will allow us to attain victory in Vietnam simultaneously with the firing of the last artillery shell and the loss of the last airplane. We hope that all concerned will remember that the demands of world leadership will certainly require that our arms in all fields be maintained at adequate levels for the demands for the years ahead. We members of the Armed Services Committee are concerned about tactical aviation and intend to lend our support to the Secretary of Defense to see that the Tactical Air Command is adequately manned in personnel and equipped with the modern aircraft, including tactical airlift aircraft, which will be necessary to meet the challenges of our responsibilities.

We owe much to the American Legion for its stand in support of the Tactical Air Command, and I am inserting its resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

RESOLUTION 264 (MARYLAND)—TACTICAL AIR COMMAND OF THE U.S. AIR FORCE COMMENDED

Whereas the present emergency in the Far East has furnished much experience relating to the constitution and control of essential tactical air forces needed for such operations; and

Whereas the American Legion has expressed much concern regarding these matters; and

Whereas this recent experience re-emphasizes the importance of the policy position on this matter previously maintained by the American Legion; and

Whereas present battlefield experience re-established the importance of getting and maintaining mastery of the air above the battlefield, providing interdiction isolating the battlefield, providing close support to ground elements in battle, and in maintaining unified control of these air elements; and

Whereas the Tactical Air Command of the U.S. Air Force has demonstrated clearly again its capacity to meet the tests of actual warfare: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion in National Convention assembled in Washington, D.C., August 30, 31 to September 1, 1966, that the Tactical Air Command be commended for its reaction to the present emergency; and be it further

Resolved, That all efforts be made to equip the Tactical Air Command with adequate numbers of modern aircraft and adequate personnel at the earliest possible date.

#### U.S. DELEGATIONS TO U.N.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday next the 21st session of the General Assembly of the United Nations will be convened. Last year the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] and I were nominated to represent the Congress. This year as is the custom the two delegates are from the other body, the Honorable FRANK CHURCH and the Honorable CLIFFORD P. CASE, whose appointments by President Johnson were confirmed by the Senate yesterday.

Following is a list of the delegates and alternates of the United States to all the U.N. General Assemblies from the 1st to and including the 21st:

#### U.S. REPRESENTATIVES TO THE U.N. GENERAL ASSEMBLIES

FIRST SESSION, FIRST PART, JANUARY 10 TO FEBRUARY 14, 1946, LONDON

##### Representatives

Secretary of State James F. Byrnes.  
Edward R. Stettinius, Jr.  
Senator Tom Connally.  
Senator Arthur Vandenberg.  
Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.

##### Alternates

Sol Bloom, Member of Congress.  
Charles A. Eaton, Member of Congress.  
Frank Walker.  
John G. Townsend, Jr.  
John Foster Dulles.

FIRST SESSION, SECOND PART, OCTOBER 23 TO DECEMBER 15, 1946, NEW YORK

##### Representatives

Warren R. Austin.  
Senator Tom Connally.  
Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg.  
Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.  
Sol Bloom, Member of Congress.

##### Alternates

Charles A. Eaton, Member of Congress.  
Helen Gahagan Douglas, Member of Congress.  
John Foster Dulles.  
Adlai E. Stevenson.

SECOND SESSION, SEPTEMBER 16, 1947

##### Representatives

Secretary of State George C. Marshall.  
Warren R. Austin.  
Herschel V. Johnson.

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.  
John Foster Dulles.

##### Alternates

Charles Fahy.  
Willard L. Thorp.  
Rev. Francis B. Sayre.  
Adlai E. Stevenson.  
Maj. Gen. John H. Hildring, U.S. Army, retired.

THIRD SESSION, SEPTEMBER 21, 1948, PARIS

##### Representatives

Secretary of State George C. Marshall.  
Warren R. Austin.  
John Foster Dulles.  
Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.  
Philip C. Jessup.  
Benjamin V. Cohen.

##### Alternates

Ray Atherton.  
Willard L. Thorp.  
Ernest A. Gross.  
Francis B. Sayre.  
Dean Rusk.

FOURTH SESSION, SEPTEMBER 20, 1949, NEW YORK

##### Representatives

Secretary of State Dean G. Acheson.  
Warren R. Austin.  
Philip C. Jessup.  
Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.  
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER.

##### Alternates

Benjamin V. Cohen.  
Charles Fahy.  
Wilson M. Compton.  
John D. Hickerson.  
Ruth Bryan Rohde.  
John C. Ross.

FIFTH SESSION, SEPTEMBER 13, 1950, NEW YORK

##### Representatives

Secretary of State Dean Acheson.  
Warren R. Austin.  
Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.  
Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN.  
Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.  
John Foster Dulles.

##### Alternates

Benjamin V. Cohen.  
JOHN S. COOPER.  
Ernest A. Gross.  
Edith S. Sampson.  
John C. Ross.

SIXTH SESSION, SEPTEMBER 6, 1951, PARIS

##### Representatives

Secretary of State Dean Acheson.  
Warren R. Austin.  
Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.  
MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD, Member of Congress.  
John M. Vorys, Member of Congress.  
Philip C. Jessup.

##### Alternates

JOHN SHERMAN COOPER.  
Ernest A. Gross.  
Benjamin V. Cohen.  
Annan Lord Strauss.  
Channing H. Tobias.

SEVENTH SESSION, OCTOBER 14, 1952, NEW YORK

##### Representatives

Secretary of State Dean Acheson.  
Warren R. Austin.  
Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.  
Senator Theodore Francis Green.  
Senator Alexander Wiley.  
Ernest A. Gross.

##### Alternates

Philip C. Jessup.  
Benjamin V. Cohen.  
Charles H. Sprague.  
Edith Sampson.  
Isador Lubin.

**EIGHTH SESSION, SEPTEMBER 14, 1953**

*Representatives*

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.  
Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.  
James F. Byrnes.  
Mrs. FRANCIS P. BOLTON, Member of Congress.

James R. Richard, Member of Congress.

*Alternates*

Archibald Carey, Jr.  
James D. Zellerbach.  
Henry Ford II.  
Dr. Charles W. Mayo.  
Oswald B. Lord.

**NINTH SESSION, SEPTEMBER 21, 1954**

*Representatives*

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.  
Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.  
Senator H. Alexander Smith.  
Senator JAMES W. FULBRIGHT.  
C. D. Jackson.  
Charles H. Mahoney.

*Alternates*

James J. Wadsworth.  
Oswald B. Lord.  
A. M. Ade Johnson.  
James P. Nash.  
Roger W. Straus.

**TENTH SESSION, SEPTEMBER 20, 1955**

*Representatives*

Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.  
Brooks Hays, Member of Congress.  
Chester E. Merrow, Member of Congress.  
Senator JOHN O. PASTORE.  
Colgate White Darden, Jr.

*Alternates*

Robert Lee Brokenburr.  
Laird Bell.  
Jacob Blaustein.  
James J. Wadsworth.  
Oswald B. Lord.

**ELEVENTH SESSION, NOVEMBER 12 TO DECEMBER 21, 1956; JANUARY 2 TO MARCH 8, 1957**

*Representatives*

Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.  
Senator William F. Knowland.  
Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY.  
Paul G. Hoffman.  
Ellsworth Bunker.

*Alternates*

James J. Wadsworth.  
Richard Lee Jones.  
Frank C. Nash.  
Edward S. Greenbaum.  
Mary P. Lord (Mrs. Oswald B.).

**TWELFTH SESSION, SEPTEMBER 17, 1957**

*Representatives*

Henry Cabot Lodge.  
A. S. J. Carnahan, Member of Congress.  
Walter H. Judd, Member of Congress.  
George Meany.  
Herman B. Wells.

*Alternates*

James W. Wadsworth.  
Irene Dunne.  
Philip Klutznick.  
Mary P. Lord.  
Genoa S. Washington.

**THIRTEENTH SESSION, SEPTEMBER 16, 1958**

*Representatives*

Henry Cabot Lodge.  
Senator MICHAEL MANSFIELD.  
Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER.  
Herman Phleger.  
George McGregor Harrison.

*Alternates*

James J. Wadsworth.  
Marian Anderson.  
Watson W. Wise.  
Mary P. Lord.  
Irving Salomon.

**FOURTEENTH SESSION, SEPTEMBER 15, 1959**

*Representatives*

Christian A. Herter.  
Henry Cabot Lodge.  
James J. Wadsworth.  
JAMES G. FULTON, Member of Congress.  
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Member of Congress.  
George Meany.  
Walter S. Robertson.

*Alternates*

Charles W. Anderson, Jr.  
Erle Cocke, Jr.  
Virgil M. Hancher.  
Mary P. Lord.  
Harold Riegelman.

**FIFTEENTH SESSION, SEPTEMBER 20, 1960**

*Representatives*

James J. Wadsworth.  
Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN.  
Senator WAYNE MORSE.  
Francis O. Wilcox.  
Mary P. Lord.

*Alternates*

Zelma Watson George (Mrs. Claiborne).  
Arthur F. Lamey.  
Frederick Blake Payne.  
Charles Rosenbaum.  
Frances E. Willis.

**FIFTEENTH SESSION (RESUMED), MARCH 7, 1961,**

**TO APRIL 2, 1961**

*Representatives*

Adlai E. Stevenson.  
Francis T. P. Plimpton.  
Charles W. Yost.  
Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.  
Philip M. Klutznick.

*Alternates*

Jonathan Brewster Bingham.  
John H. Morrow.  
Charles P. Noyes.

**SIXTEENTH SESSION, SEPTEMBER 19, 1961**

*Representatives*

Adlai E. Stevenson.  
OMAR BURLISON, Member of Congress.  
Mrs. Marguerite Stitt Church, Member of Congress.  
Francis T. P. Plimpton.  
Arthur H. Dean.

*Alternates*

Charles W. Yost.  
Clifton R. Wharton.  
Philip M. Klutznick.  
Jonathan Brewster Bingham.  
Gladys Avery Tillett (Mrs. Charles).

**SEVENTEENTH SESSION, SEPTEMBER 18, 1962**

*Representatives*

Adlai E. Stevenson.  
Senator ALBERT GORE.  
Senator GORDON ALLOTT.  
Francis T. P. Plimpton.  
Arthur H. Dean.

*Alternates*

Charles W. Yost.  
Philip M. Klutznick.  
Jonathan Brewster Bingham.  
Carl T. Rowan.  
Marietta P. Tree (Mrs. Ronald).

**EIGHTEENTH SESSION, SEPTEMBER 17, 1963**

*Representatives*

Adlai E. Stevenson.  
Mrs. EDNA F. KELLY, Member of Congress.  
WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, Member of Congress.  
Francis T. P. Plimpton.  
Charles W. Yost.

*Alternates*

Mercer Cook.  
Charles C. Steele.  
Jonathan Brewster Bingham.  
Sidney R. Yates.  
Jane Warner Dick (Mrs. Edison).

**NINETEENTH SESSION, DECEMBER 1, 1964 TO FEBRUARY 18, 1965**

*Representatives*

Adlai E. Stevenson.  
Senator RUSSELL B. LONG.  
Senator FRANK CARLSON.  
William C. Foster.  
Francis T. P. Plimpton.

*Alternates*

Charles W. Yost.  
Franklin H. Williams.  
Gladys Avery Tillett (Mrs. Charles).  
Richard N. Gardner.  
Charles P. Noyes.

**TWENTIETH SESSION, COMMENCING SEPTEMBER 21, 1965**

*Representatives*

Arthur J. Goldberg.  
Charles W. Yost.  
BARRATT O'HARA, Member of Congress.  
PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN, Member of Congress.  
William C. Foster.

*Alternates*

James M. Nabrit, Jr.  
James Roosevelt.  
Eugenia Anderson.  
William P. Rogers.  
Frances E. Willis.

**TWENTY-FIRST SESSION, COMMENCING SEPTEMBER 20, 1966**

*Representatives*

Arthur J. Goldberg.  
James M. Nabrit, Jr.  
Senator FRANK CHURCH.  
Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE.  
William C. Foster.

*Alternates*

James Roosevelt.  
Eugenia Anderson.  
Patricia Roberts Harris.  
George L. Killion.  
Harding P. Bancroft.

**THE URGENT NEED FOR AN URBAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, as one who has long urged the creation of a standing committee on urban affairs, I was heartened to read the editorial in yesterday's New York Times supporting the creation of such a committee.

"If urban problems merit the creation of a Federal department," the editorial pointed out, "they also justify permanent congressional committees."

When I introduced my resolution—House Resolution 637—to establish an Urban Affairs Committee on January 12, I pointed out the benefits of creating a single committee whose staff and members would be primarily concerned with urban problems. We are fast becoming a nation of cities, and cities present many of our greatest problems as well as much of our greatest promise. They deserve the full attention of a committee of Congress.

Originally I had thought that this would be an appropriate subject for the consideration of the Joint Committee on



the Reorganization of Congress. Therefore, on March 1, I, along with 29 colleagues, sent a letter to the chairmen of that committee, asking that it "give favorable consideration to the establishment of a new standing committee to be called the Committee on Urban Affairs." Some outside witnesses, including the National League of Cities, made similar proposals.

When the joint committee made its report on July 28, it agreed that "the phenomenal growth of urban areas, the enormous problems this growth has spawned, and the current and probable future expansion of Federal programs to deal with these programs, signified by the creation of a new Department of Housing and Urban Development, point to the need for specialized congressional recognition of this increasingly significant area of public policy." This statement would seem to suggest a flat endorsement of the concept of a separate committee to handle urban affairs. Instead, however, the committee recommended only that "the Banking and Currency Committee shall be redesignated the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs." No jurisdictional changes were proposed.

Since the committee issued its report, the demand for a standing committee on urban affairs has begun to intensify. Some 15 Members of the House have now introduced resolutions similar to my House Resolution 637. In his testimony before the Senate Government Operations Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization in the other body, Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY recommended that such a committee be formed. Then, on September 8, Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS introduced Senate Resolution 302, to establish a Senate Committee on Urban Affairs. His resolution was cosponsored by Senators BREWSTER, EDWARD KENNEDY, PELL, and RIBICOFF.

Not surprisingly, then, the creation of such a committee was a subject of some interest at the meeting on urban America which was held here earlier this week, and was endorsed by the mayor of New York in his speech to that gathering.

Now that the discussion of this significant proposal has begun in earnest, it is time that we in this House did something about it. The rules of the House should be amended to create a standing committee on urban affairs.

The Times editorial, which cogently makes the case for such a committee, follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 14, 1966]  
CONGRESS AND THE CITIES

It is a commonplace among mayors and others familiar with municipal affairs that they cannot hope to solve their problems, largely national in origin, without Federal help on a massive scale. Yet the Federal Government has been so slow to recognize its responsibility that at the hearings before Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF's subcommittee last month there were no accurate figures available on how much Washington was currently spending on aid to cities.

Robert C. Weaver, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, estimated that expenditures were \$28 billion a year, while At-

torney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach put them at \$13 billion. Something is wrong when no one in the Administration knows just how much is being spent and just what it has to show for its outlays.

Mayor Lindsay has joined his voice to a number of others that have been raised in support of a constructive proposal that could be of great value in dealing with urban problems. It is that Congress establish standing committees on urban affairs in both the Senate and the House.

If urban problems merit the creation of a Federal department, they also justify permanent Congressional committees. Many Federal policies have contributed enormously to the difficulties in which the cities now find themselves. Thus Federal mortgages, housing and highway construction measures have all contributed to the mass exodus of middle-income families from the central cities to the suburbs. And Federal welfare policies have had a great deal to do with the influx of poverty-stricken migrants into the city slums. The cities are the focal point of the national fight for civil rights, for improved housing and education.

Both houses need permanent committees with adequate professional staffs to study the great social and economic forces—and the policies—that are transforming our cities. Seventy per cent of our population now lives in them and the prospect is that this concentration will continue to increase. The cities loom as the nation's biggest problem. Congress will not be in position to find solutions unless it is equipped for the task.

#### PLEA TO STOP SPREAD OF ATOMIC WEAPONS AMONG NONNUCLEAR POWERS

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for a special order today for the purpose of reviewing a proposal in the newspapers today, including the New York Times, on behalf of 290 citizens. They are identified as the Educational Committee To Halt the Imminent Spread of Atomic Weapons among non-nuclear powers. They make an astonishing and, to my view, a very unwise and dangerous proposal which would have a very adverse effect upon NATO and cause deep concern within West Germany.

#### THE NEW YORK WORLD JOURNAL TRIBUNE

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, at long last, the New York World Journal Tribune is with us.

An amalgam of three famous newspapers—the New York Herald Tribune, the Journal American, and the World Telegram and Sun—our new newspaper

seems to have inherited the leading and outstanding features of the previous papers.

No matter what the relative merits of the present newspapers that served us so well during the recent strike, the New York Daily News, the New York Post, and the New York Times, it is always good to have a different point of view and a different approach, and so the New York World Journal Tribune will round out a needed fourth force for New York City.

Hopefully, the newspaper will be successful, not only in its format and content, which already meets this promise, but also in earning capacity so that there need be no fear of termination.

I know that my colleagues in all of the 50 States will join with me in happy contemplation of the fact that a new newspaper has been born in the greatest city in the world.

#### AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION—APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2(a), Public Law 89-491, the Chair appoints as members of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Messrs. DONOHUE, of Massachusetts; WELTNER, of Georgia; SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania; and POFF, of Virginia.

#### ANTIRIOT LEGISLATION

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, when the 1966 civil rights bill was being debated before the House, I joined in the passage of an antiriot amendment to this bill introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER]. It now seems likely that the civil rights bill will not be passed into law in this Congress.

The continuing riots in major cities around the United States, however, point up the continuing need for legislation along the lines of the Cramer amendment which passed the House by the overwhelming vote of 389 to 25. Consequently, I am happy to join with Mr. CRAMER and other colleagues in introducing this legislation and urging its speedy passage by the House.

#### BROCK CALLS FOR HOWE'S RESIGNATION

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago I warned the House that a draft bill existed within the Office of Education and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that would redraw local school district lines on a metropolitan areawide basis and encourage schoolbusing and pairing through the use of billions in additional Federal aid. I warned that this legislation would operate under the metropolitan section of the pending housing bill.

A few hours later, U.S. Education Commissioner Harold Howe called my statement "ridiculous and untrue."

Yesterday the gentleman from New York, Congressman PAUL FINO, released the text of just such draft legislation. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare admitted its authenticity, but excused it as just one of several plans under discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I call on President Johnson to repudiate this draft bill and everybody associated with it. I call on him to let the Congress know how many other draft schoolbusing bills exist. Since when must the administration operate under a veil of secrecy regarding our Nation's schools? Since when have they needed to hide their programs for this Nation from its citizens?

Commissioner Howe denied the existence of his plan for national schoolbusing, only to be embarrassed by its revelation the very next day. Such actions are inexcusable for a major official of this administration. In light of Mr. Howe's apparent refusal to tell Congress the truth, I hope that the President will ask for his resignation.

#### POLITICAL EXPEDIENCY

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, we all know that President Johnson's anti-inflation message as it came to the Congress was "too little and too late."

But an editorial in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat for Wednesday, September 14, 1966, points out very well, I think, another aspect of this message. Entitled "Political Expediency," it goes on to say that everyone knows that the President's proposals will "do virtually nothing to cap the inflation spiral."

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the editorial:

#### POLITICAL EXPEDIENCY

When the President poured a little water on the overheated economy by moving to

rescind industrial expansion tax credits, everyone knew it would do virtually nothing to cap the inflation spiral. But it gipped no one, except a few industrialists.

This is an election year, and Mr. Johnson's act was considered by political pundits shrewd politics.

What the nation needs is hard-nosed decision to siphon the water out of overspend money, especially government prodigality. But political temporizing is accepted as routine, expected, inevitable.

Government by political expediency has not been a fixation solely of the present Administration. It was evident in the conduct of many Presidents. Lyndon Johnson just happens to be an expert in this field, partly because of his consensus safari, partly because he is a master politician.

Commentators and critics considered it simply a governmental realism that no taxes would be levied before the November ballot—though afterward, look out.

Without conscious cynicism, they found little or no fault with the Administration for deliberately vague pledges to curtail federal expenditures, which they know will not occur.

There was nothing abnormal in letting the country continue, with only vocal remonstrance, on an inflationary binge, spending like leave-famished sailors suddenly on the town.

Expediency in administering government is the syndrome of modern politics. Use of power for vote-getting is now more pronounced than ever, because there is more federal power. Half of each administration's term are election years, and Washington veers more to polishing election apples than doing what is best for the nation.

Perhaps lack of determination to set an unpopular but wiser course for the country is responsible for much of Mr. Johnson's slump in popularity reported by poll-takers. This could be true in the Vietnam war issue, as well as in domestic problems.

Politics is not an evil factor in the presidency; overweighting politics for expediency's sake can be bad and self-defeating.

Lyndon Johnson wants to be a great President, as Americans wish their President to be. Such a niche in history and national esteem calls for courage and decision to do what is right and needed—not merely to follow the beckoning, easy lures of political expediency.

#### THE ADMINISTRATION AND THE FIGHT AGAINST INFLATION

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, for many months now, many of our colleagues have been calling public attention to the dangers of inflation. We have proposed specific steps to fight high prices and we have urged the administration to get about the business of protecting the people. Now, months later, the administration has proposed to act.

I would hope, therefore, that the Congress—including our colleagues on both

sides of the aisle—will devote immediate attention, and on a completely nonpartisan basis, to the administration's belated but comprehensive anti-inflation program.

Although the administration is at least 6 months late in recognizing the serious effects of high prices and high interest rates and the real threat of further inflation, it has now come full circle in seeing the danger and in responding to it in terms which many of us have been urging on the administration for many months now.

Just this past weekend, in my own district, I took the opportunity again to talk with many of my constituents and to visit several stores and supermarkets in order to better understand exactly what inflation is doing to people. Inflation is not simply a theory. It is harsh reality. It is taking precious dollars out of the pockets of people who can least spare them, and it is steadily lowering the living standards of people already existing on marginal incomes.

We would be less than consistent and true to our obligations, therefore, if—now that the administration has in effect conceded that we were right all along—we gave to its recommendations anything but earnest, immediate, and objective consideration.

This does not mean that we should rubberstamp the administration's program or approve all its recommendations without change. On the contrary, such proposals as those to suspend temporarily the 7-percent investment tax credit and the use of accelerated depreciation are inherently controversial and should be carefully studied to determine their effect on our common objective: a steadily growing economy with stable prices.

Our problem now is to make certain that the remedy fits the sickness, that the administration's anti-inflation policies will effectively arrest rising prices and interest rates without going so far as to force the economy into a decline and bring on a recession and growing unemployment.

As I have suggested in several speeches and statements this year, the sensitive nature of a full-employment economy makes it imperative to use both the right tools and the right timing to fight inflation. The administration's excessive delay in making up its mind to fight inflation has increased the danger that its tools or its timing, or both, may be inappropriate to the need.

But this is a danger that Congress must explore immediately. We must consider two possibilities, basically: that the forces of inflation have become so thoroughly installed that the administration's relatively moderate anti-inflation program will not be sufficient, and, on the other hand, that inflation may already be reaching its peak and that by adopting policies to hold down the economy the administration may only accelerate a downturn already in the making.



As the authoritative publication, *Business Week*, pointed out in its editorial this week:

What clearly is required now is the kind of fiscal restraint that will slow down the growth of demand in the U.S. economy without causing an equivalent slowdown in the growth of productive capacity.

The formulation of a balanced program to deal with the present strains—and one which will take effect with maximum speed—is now the prime requirement of national economic policy. As between the proposed suspension of the 7-percent investment tax credit and a reduction in nondefense Federal spending, for instance, the latter would obviously have a more immediate and effective impact on restraining demand.

In any event, however, we can only welcome the administration's newfound awareness that inflation is here and that it is painful and its apparent determination to control it. Among the policies and recommendations announced by the President and other administration spokesmen are several which I have repeatedly urged upon the administration and which I especially welcome.

For example, the President's decision to reduce by 10 percent, or about \$3 billion, the lower priority portion of his Federal Budget will help assure that there will be no budget deficit this year to add inflationary pressure to the economy—if the administration follows through on its promise, and Congress acts accordingly.

By the same token, his recognition of the need to pay for current expenditures out of current revenues during an inflationary period represents a very encouraging development.

Of particular importance is the administration's suspension of the sale of special kinds of Government securities, including participation certificates which have been a major factor in forcing interest rates, or the cost of money to borrowers to record high levels. For those of us who vigorously opposed the Sales Participation Act when the administration forced it through Congress earlier this year, the administration's action confirms our prediction that use of the participation device would only push up interest rates and eventually add to the taxpayer's burden—a high price to pay for the sole purpose of obscuring budget expenditures.

In this and related respects, the administration is recognizing that its excessive reliance on monetary policy—higher interest rates and tighter money—has unbalanced the economy. While monetary policy, properly used, can help control inflation, it cannot carry the whole burden. In the present situation, it has failed to stop higher prices and has unfairly penalized homebuyers and small businessmen as well as threatened to halt the balanced growth in the economy.

As the President has now pointed out, inflation imposes a cruel and unjust tax on all the people. This inflation has

caused sustained price increases in food, services and industrial production. It has weakened the competitive strength of American industry in world trade. It has hurt our delicate balance-of-payments position. And it has robbed the tens of millions of Americans who depend on fixed incomes.

The responsibility now belongs to Congress to consider the administration's policy in good faith and on its merits and to reach agreement on a course of action that will control inflation and at the same time permit the economy to sustain the kind of prosperity that will benefit all.

#### FINO CHALLENGES JOHNSON TO DISAVOW PROPOSED "EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1967"

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I held a press conference to disclose the administration's secret "Equal Educational Opportunity Act of 1967." I think that the Members of this House will be interested to read this incredible document.

I am putting in the Record the following sequence of events: First, the statement made by Representative Brock alleging Office of Education plans for metropolitan areawide school redistricting and busing; second, the denial by Education Commissioner Howe, who said the charge was ridiculous; third, my speech on the Equal Educational Opportunity Act of 1967; fourth, a copy of the key sections of the Equal Educational Opportunity Act; fifth, Secretary Gardner's denial, and sixth, my further commentary.

I challenge the administration to come clean. Secretary Gardner has said that my document is one of several drafts of legislation being considered. Let the administration show us the others—if there are others. Probably they are worse. This talk of other drafts is a red herring. This bill I disclosed is the bill. Its budget figures are detailed. It was just ready to go to the Bureau of the Budget.

Let anyone who doubts all this read the statements of Harold Howe. He has said:

If I have my way, schools will be built for the primary purpose of economic and social integration.

How could this man have the gall to label Representative Brock's charge as "ridiculous and untrue" when his top assistants had prepared the bill I disclosed containing just the points BILL BROCK had raised? Commissioner Howe is a political liar engaging in tricking the Congress.

I think that the President has an obligation to repudiate this deception and doubletalk on the part of his social planning underlings. Otherwise the Republican Party will be obliged to assume that while the voice is the voice of HEW, the hand is the hand of Johnson. If the President disapproves, let him demand the resignation of Mr. Howe.

The material referred to follows:

#### BROCK ASKS DISCLOSURE OF METRO BUSING BILL

Congressman BILL BROCK (R-Tenn.) today on the Floor of the U.S. House of Representatives demanded that the Johnson Administration make public the existence of draft legislation to use the Metropolitan Development title of the pending housing bill (S. 3708) to introduce a multi-billion dollar national school busing scheme.

Congressman Brock said, "The 1967 Education bill already has been drafted and submitted to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and apparently is destined to become 'must' legislation for the 90th Congress. The real test, however, will come on this year's pending housing bill, when the House of Representatives will consider the Metropolitan Development section. It will be through the proposed Metro title of the bill that Congress will be asked next year to endorse a multi-billion dollar program designed to achieve 'Racial Balance' in virtually every metropolitan area of the country. Thus, if the House of Representatives approves the proposed Metro title of the bill now, the Administration will have won its biggest test and the scene will be set for forced busing next year.

"For these reasons it is imperative this draft legislation be revealed before Congress is tricked into voting for a supposedly innocent Metro title of the Housing bill.

"In terms of radical departure from the traditional Federal role, the school busing scheme will make the open housing section of the House passed 1966 Civil Rights bill look like tiddly winks. Using Metro as the statutory foundation, the Johnson Administration will ask for:

"1. Metropolitan area-wide rezoning of school attendance areas, without regard to existing state or county lines, to compel racial balance in public schools;

"2. Busing of suburban school children into city schools, and busing of city pupils to suburban schools at Federal insistence and expense. Failure to comply with compulsory racial balance will result in massive penalties in a vast array of existing Federal-aid programs included in the pending Metro section of the Housing bill.

"3. Complete obliteration of present school district boundary lines, with free transfers between school districts.

"4. Federal subsidies to underwrite the cost of rewriting history books so as to recast the history of racial and religious minorities.

"I insist the Johnson Administration make public the existence of this legislation as well as its plans to achieve school busing under the Metro title of the pending housing bill. It would be better for the White House and the Office of Education to have the honesty to make public their intentions, along with their motives; but if they refuse I intend to fight to remove the veil of secrecy from this radical plan which would destroy local responsibility for our nation's educational system," Congressman Brock concluded.

Congressman Brock also inserted in the Record an article in the Washington Post on September 9th by Robert Novak and Rowland Evans entitled the "Education Bomb-

shell", which summarized the proposed legislation and its impact.

U.S. Education Commissioner Harold Howe II, questioned about Brock's charge, told United Press International it was "ridiculous and untrue."

"The Office of Education has no intention of rewriting history or of compelling of school busing or in the redrawing of school boundary lines," Howe said.

"The Office of Education firmly committed to the principle of local control of public schools," he said.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN PAUL A. FINO, REPUBLICAN, OF NEW YORK, ROOM H-202, U.S. CAPITOL, SEPTEMBER 14, 1966

Gentlemen: Thank you for coming here today.

I have here in my hand a document which can only be referred to as "radical." It is a memorandum detailing the Administration's proposed \$6 billion "Equal Educational Opportunity Act of 1967." The memo is a product of a high level task force, and has already gone to HEW Secretary Gardner.

In a nutshell, the proposed legislation would set up a multibillion dollar effort to force racial balance in the nation's schools. The billions of dollars proposed to be spent would be used for programs such as construction of schools to serve mixed communities, redrawing school district lines, school busing programs, pupil exchanges between suburbs and slums, revision of textbooks to stress the contribution of minority groups, and so forth. I will discuss all this in some detail in just a moment.

This measure apparently has the White House stamp of approval. It is taken in large measure from a June White House Conference called "To Fulfill These Rights." The radical proposals suggested were summed up as "Equal Educational Opportunity." One member of this radical council was Floyd McKissick, the head of CORE and a vigorous spokesman for "black power." I am amazed that the reach of "black power" is long enough to design Administration legislation.

The immediate importance of the proposed 1967 legislation is that it lets the cat out of the bag concerning the Administration's plans to use the "metropolitan planning" title of this year's omnibus housing bill as a weapon to reshape both housing and education across the nation.

As ranking signer of the minority views in the House Banking Committee report on the omnibus housing bill, I pointed out to the House that the "metropolitan planning" section of the bill was a Trojan Horse for rampant federal coercion. Now we have indisputable proof.

I want to make my position crystal clear. I have always supported omnibus housing bills since I came to Congress in 1953. I have also always supported civil rights legislation. Notwithstanding some doubts, I voted for the open-housing section of this year's civil rights bill. But this bill is too much. And "Metropolitan planning" is too much. This is not a question of civil rights. It is a question of civil privileges. I am for equality, not unbridled privileges. And I am convinced virtually every American regardless of party, share my opposition to school busing and elimination of neighborhood schools.

Now for the bill. The title is the "Equal Educational Opportunity Act of 1967." The bill has six titles. Besides enacting new laws in the field of education, the bill would amend two other laws—one existing—the Civil Rights Act of 1964—and one proposed, the metro planning section of this year's omnibus housing bill (S. 3708).

Of the six titles, four are fairly non-controversial ones dealing with education. I will not comment on them. The other two are bombshells. Taken together, they constitute the most radical legislation ever drawn up in these United States.

Title II of the so-called "Equal Educational Opportunity" bill sets up a program of federal aid for school construction. But unfortunately, the only way a community gets such aid is to tie it in with one of the busing or pairing schemes under Title III or to surrender school districting control throughout an entire metropolitan area.

Let me read you the explanation the social planners have for giving federal money in support of school construction. I quote:

"The program is aimed particularly at the facilitation of more flexible education programs, in conjunction with educational innovations such as those supplementary services and arrangements which can be funded under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. In addition, reduction of de facto segregation would be encouraged by combining grants under this title with extra cost grants for construction projects designed to achieve integrated education under Title III of this legislative package."

What this means is simple. Only communities using Title III money for pairing, busing of pupils, pupil exchanges or textbook revision would be able to get school construction grants.

Now let me read you the explanation of how the Administration seeks to use the "metropolitan planning" section of the 1966 omnibus housing bill to compel metropolitan area-wide school redistricting and busing. Section (d) of Title II provides that bonus educational facilities grants will be given to communities that plan schools and school districts on a metropolitan area-wide basis. Let me read to you how the planners condemn themselves out of their own mouth:

"Supplementary grants providing an additional 20% of the project cost would be made to projects which fit into metropolitan area plans. This increased federal share would provide an incentive for joint school planning in metropolitan areas. This proposal is patterned after the proposed supplementary grants for planned metropolitan development contained in Title II of the Senate-passed 'Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966.' If enacted into law, that legislation could simply be amended to include school construction projects assisted under this proposed program in the definition of an eligible 'metropolitan development project' in the same manner as libraries assisted under the Library Services and Construction Act and hospitals assisted under the Public Health Service Act are covered in the pending legislation. The location and scope of educational parks should be an important component of any comprehensive metropolitan area-wide planning."

In other words, the Metro section of the pending Housing bill will be used as the foundation for this multi-billion dollar scheme. When this section of the housing bill comes to a vote within the next few weeks, the real question will be whether or not a majority of the members of the House will be tricked into voting for school busing. Now that this document has been revealed, I predict that Metro will be overwhelmingly rejected.

It is becoming increasingly apparent why the President feels he must maintain his present majority in the House in the November elections.

Let me mention a few of the specific "racial balance" proposals set forth in Title III of

this bill. These are the plans specifically proposed to revamp education throughout the United States. Number one—school busing. Number two—redistricting of school districts to achieve racial balance. Number three—pairing of schools. Number four—suburban and slum pupil exchanges. Number five—revision of school textbooks on behalf of minority groups.

Make no mistake about it. This bill specifically proposes that de facto segregation be made illegal and federal grants given to fifteen programs of overcoming de facto segregation in the schools.

This is an incredible document. Read it. See for yourself. Back in June, a White House conference advocated putting poverty and housing funds into the metropolitan planning kitty in addition to education. Perhaps that is what they want to do next. This is the "Great Society" in action. This is why the President wants a Democratic Congress. This is why we need more Republicans in Congress. This battle is not over. Thank you.

#### EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1967—DETAILED EXPLANATION AND JUSTIFICATION

##### TITLE II: CONSTRUCTION OF SCHOOL FACILITIES

###### Purpose

To help meet the pressing need for modern school facilities, especially in central cities and rural areas where outmoded facilities exist in conjunction with high concentrations of disadvantaged children. The program is aimed particularly at the facilitation of more flexible educational programs, in conjunction with educational innovations such as those supplementary services and arrangements which can be funded under title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

In addition, reduction of de facto segregation would be encouraged by combining grants under this title with the extra-cost grants for construction projects designed to achieve integrated education under title III of this legislative package.

###### Program

(a) Survey of construction needs by State agency: Grants for an initial inventory of facilities would first be made so that within the first 6 to 9 months of the program a complete and reliable inventory of educational facility needs would be available. This inventory would then form the basis for establishing priorities as to the areas of greatest need within each State before the project approval process begins.

(b) Basic grants for construction projects: These grants would build an estimated 110,000 classrooms over a 5-year period. Funds would be allotted among the States on the basis of relative per capita income and State educational effort. The basic grant could not ordinarily exceed 50 percent of the cost of construction.

(c) Administration of grants: State educational agencies would assign priorities to project applications on the basis of objective need criteria, with preference for projects designed to alleviate segregation or racial imbalance. The Commissioner of Education would have final approval authority before a project could be funded under this title.

(d) Supplementary grants: Supplementary grants providing an additional 20 percent of the project cost would be made to projects which fit into metropolitan area plans. This increased Federal share would provide an incentive for joint school district planning in metropolitan areas. This proposal is patterned after the proposed supplementary grants for planned metropolitan



development contained in title II of the Senate-passed "Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966" (S. 3708). If enacted into law, that legislation could simply be amended to include school construction projects assisted under this proposed program in the definition of an eligible "metropolitan development project" in the same manner as libraries assisted under the Library Services and Construction Act and hospitals assisted under the Public Health Service Act are covered in the pending legislation. The location and scope of educational parks should be an important component of any comprehensive metropolitan areawide planning.

(e) Loans: While outright grants should be restricted to special construction needs which impose heavy burdens upon the resources of local educational agencies and the States, the Federal government can, with minimum budgetary impact, assist schools which undertake to spread out the cost of constructing facilities by facilitating the marketing of long-term bonds and by lowering the interest rate for local educational agencies. For example, rapidly expanding middle-income communities are in a better position to afford the construction of needed school facilities than other areas, but the rapid development of an area does impose a fairly sudden impact of school-age children. While able to afford the facilities, such communities nevertheless find it desirable to spread the cost over a long period of time.

Furthermore, even in the case of projects which do receive Federal grants for a share of the cost of construction, few construction projects will be funded without requiring substantial local funds. Accordingly, in most cases, a part of the cost of most projects will have to be obtained by borrowing. The maximum maturity of school bonds—the spread-out period—is rather short compared to the long-term loans which institutions of higher education can obtain under the Higher Education Facilities Act and the College Housing Program.

In addition, the interest rate on school bonds is now significantly higher than the "ideal" of 3 percent.

It is therefore recommended that a school bond support program be devised using the procedures of the Federal National Mortgage Association. FNMA may now issue debentures to secure funds from private investors with which to purchase home mortgages in its secondary market operations at a ratio of 15 times its capital and reserves (i.e., the net cost is one-fifteenth of the mortgage purchased). In view of the similar ratio on the sale of participation certificates in Federal loans (a 5 percent reserve, or a 20-to-1 ratio of loans to net cost), a special fund or account could be administered by FNMA through which school bonds would be purchased out of funds secured by the sale of FNMA obligations equal to 20 times the appropriations deposited in the fund. The net cost to the Federal Government would be one-twentieth of the total amount of such school construction loans, assuming a 5 percent reserve requirement.

As an additional part of the program, the Commissioner of Education, would be authorized to make payments on behalf of the local educational agencies for that portion of the interest necessary to make up the difference between a 3 percent rate of interest and the rate which FNMA must pay on its outstanding debentures which provided the funds for the purchase of the school bonds.

### Funding

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1968	Fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970	Fiscal year 1971	Fiscal year 1972
Basic grants.....		930,000	1,108,000	1,284,000	1,274,000
Loans.....		200,000	100,000	100,000	
Supplemental grants.....		120,000	140,000	160,000	160,000
State administration (including inventory in fiscal year 1968).....	57,000	10,000	11,000	13,000	13,000
Research.....		10,000	11,000	13,000	13,000
Total.....	57,000	1,270,000	1,370,000	1,570,000	1,460,000

### TITLE III: GRANTS TO ASSIST SCHOOLS IN THE PROCESS OF DESEGREGATION

#### Purpose

To assist communities throughout the Nation to cope with problems of segregation and racial imbalance in order to facilitate racial, ethnic and socio-economic integration.

#### Program

(a) Educational excellence grants: Local educational agencies would be eligible for Federal grants to assist in achieving integrated education. On the assumption that integrated education involved added costs to accommodate educationally disadvantaged students, Federal grants would be offered to schools which have few or no students from minority racial or ethnic groups in order to facilitate educational integration and reduce educational disparities. As one alternative, a formula similar to that in the impact aid program (with a per pupil Federal payment multiplied by the increased number of children in integrated schools for 5 years) would provide a real incentive for schools to desegregate completely over a 5-year period.

Federal grants would be offered to school districts for use in specific neighborhoods which show promise of being able to maintain integrated education (such as Hyde Park in Chicago) or to achieve integration by attracting white students to exceptional schools currently serving predominantly Negro residential areas (including appropriate schools in urban renewal areas). The grants may be used to produce exceptional education programs, attractive to parents of all races, by supporting, *inter alia*, superior salaries for master teachers, improved instructional equipment, lighted schoolhouse-community centers for around-the-clock superior programs, stipends for visiting lecturers, individualized instruction, and reduced pupil-teacher ratios.

(b) In addition to expanding training institutes to prepare local school personnel to deal with problems of racial imbalance as well as de jure segregation, title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 would be amended to provide grants to support techniques appropriate to correct *de facto* segregation in individual communities. Such techniques could include:

1. Comprehensive, district-wide rezoning of school attendance areas to obtain maximum heterogeneity.
2. Pairing, grouping or clustering of adjacent Negro and white schools a division by grade level in two or more residential areas.
3. Reorganization of the use of schools; reorganizing the grades of a school; converting schools to other uses; closing schools; changing feeder patterns; grade pattern reorganization.

4. Careful site selection to locate new schools so as to maximize integration of residentially segregated student populations.

5. Increased bussing from overcrowded to underutilized schools.

6. Development of "magnet" high schools, each specializing in a different subject area with enrollment open to the entire school district on the basis of interest rather than ability.

7. Development of supplemental educational centers, comprehensive community schools and shared time programs to draw district-wide enrollment as well as participation from private and parochial schools.

8. Open enrollment, voluntary enrollment and free transfers.

9. Creation of metropolitan school districts to include urban and suburban areas.

10. Suburban-Inner City pupil exchanges.

11. In-class pupil grouping to avoid racial separation, development of upgraded primary classes; remedial and compensatory programs within the framework of regular classroom structure.

12. Inservice training for teachers and other school personnel; employment of specialists to advise school personnel, parents, children and the public on problems of desegregation; improving guidance and counseling services.

13. Development of new curricular materials, particularly those including proper representation or racial and religious minorities.

14. Teacher assignment to assure faculty integration at all schools.

15. Improvement of recruitment and advancement of minority group teachers and of white teachers who are motivated to teach in ghetto schools and in transitional programs.

(c) Extra-cost grants for construction to achieve integration: Grants would be made by the Commissioner of Education (not allocated by State) to meet the extra costs of constructing new schools, including special education centers and educational parks and complexes located on the borders of ghettos under plans insuring interracial attendance of students.

Insofar as the acquisition of large blocks of land and the construction methods are more expensive than the conventional school facility the Federal government should cover 100 percent of the difference. Preference would be given to multiple school district applications, especially those joining suburban and core-city districts.

### Funding

[In thousands of dollars]

Fiscal year 1968.....	175,000
Fiscal year 1969.....	275,000
Fiscal year 1970.....	375,000
Fiscal year 1971.....	375,000
Fiscal year 1972.....	375,000

## Equal Educational Opportunity Act of 1967

[In millions of dollars]

	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972
I. Grants to local education agencies for self-assessment, planning, and evaluation.....	75	75	75	75	75
II. Construction of school facilities.....	57	1,270	1,370	1,570	1,460
III. Grants to assist schools in the process of desegregation.....	175	275	375	375	375
IV. Educational personnel training and staff development.....	25	40	50	60	60
V. Expanded pupil personnel services <sup>1</sup> .....	5	5	10	14	25
VI. Educational programs for adults.....	15	50	150	200	250
Total.....	352	1,715	2,030	2,294	2,245

<sup>1</sup> Amounts represent increases in the funding authorization of title V-A of NEA; no specific funds would be earmarked for the additional pupil personnel services authorized.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 15, 1966]  
FINO SAYS 1967 BILL CALLS FOR BUSING—  
GARDNER DENIES HE PLANS TO SEEK SUCH  
LEGISLATION

WASHINGTON, September 14.—Representative PAUL A. FINO asserted today—and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare denied—that the Administration was considering a bill specifically proposing school busing and redistricting school districts to achieve racial balance.

The Bronx Republican said at a news conference that he had obtained a copy of "the Administration's proposed 'Equal Education Opportunity Act of 1967'" and said "this measure apparently has the White House stamp of approval."

"In a nutshell," he said, "the proposed legislation would set up a multibillion dollar effort to force racial balance in the nation's schools."

He called it "the most radical legislation ever drawn up in these United States" and said it would set up a program of Federal school construction aid.

"But unfortunately," he continued, "the only way a community gets such aid is to tie it in with one of the busing or pairing schemes" or "surrender school districting control throughout an entire metropolitan area."

Mr. FINO said the draft was "indisputable proof" that the metropolitan planning section of the Administration's urban development bill is "a Trojan horse for rampant Federal coercion."

Representative WILLIAM E. BROCK 3d, Republican of Tennessee, made a similar charge yesterday.

Secretary John W. Gardner said in a statement that the document Mr. FINO had displayed was an "unofficial discussion paper."

"We can say flatly that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare has no intention whatever of submitting legislation that would compel school busing or rezoning," Mr. Gardner added.

Mr. Gardner said his department was "reviewing many draft proposals for legislation, none of which have any official status, many of which will eventually be rejected."

He stated the department's concern with "the improvement of education throughout the nation and with the assurance of equal educational opportunity for all, but he added:

"It should be emphasized, however, that any legislation proposed by the department will embody the historic American principle of local supervision and control of public education."

## FINO REPLY TO GARDNER, SEPTEMBER 14

Mr. Gardner says that no legislation will be introduced to compel busing or other methods of ending racial imbalance in the schools. The people at HEW know—and I know—that subsidies can be set up in such

a way as to amount to compulsion if made a part of a metro aid package. "What I want to know is whether they are going to submit the bill I exposed."

## EVIDENCE MOUNTS ON PROFESSIONAL AGITATORS FOMENTING RIOTS AND CIVIL DISTURBANCES AND HOUSE MEMBERS DEMAND ACTION ON H.R. 17642, THE CRAMER ANTIRIOT BILL

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, evidence from many sources continues to mount indicating that many of the most serious riots and civil disturbances taking place under the guise of civil rights are being engineered, encouraged and incited by professional agitators who travel the country stirring up dissension and strife.

Ralph McGill, liberal publisher of the Atlanta Constitution, recently exposed the fact that "in civil rights circles it is said that Havana money took over SNICK—SNCC"—which is substantiated by the fact that many SNICK demonstrators are found shouting Castro slogans, as well as by the Cleveland grand jury findings of Communist influence in the problems created in that city.

Ralph McGill further points out that many of the more reliable supporters of SNICK have been "replaced by the likes of New York Attorney Victor Rabinowitz, registered in Washington as an agent for the Castro government."

McGill continues:

The Federal government has been patient far too long with professional agitators who travel from State to State whipping up emotions in the name of civil rights.

Added to this information is the known fact that Robert Williams, escapee indicted in North Carolina and a fugitive from justice now embracing Castro's communism in Havana, is directing some of the efforts as the absentee head of RAM, a militant Negro group that teaches guerrilla tactics and violence on an outspoken, planned basis. Williams broadcasts his hate-America

droolings from Havana and his seditious material is mailed or bootlegged into the United States for distribution—including Raoul Castro's guerrilla tactics handbook.

Stokely Carmichael, head of SNICK, is preaching that Western civilization must go, that if brick walls in place of windows are built as a precaution against rioters and looters, then "it just means we have to move from Molotov cocktails to dynamite," and that the Vietnam war is a white man's war, encouraging Negroes not to serve.

"Police brutality" is being used as a slogan to whiplash all law enforcement authorities, and as a license in many instances to violate the law with impunity, by some of the professional agitators.

All of this adds up to the need for action by Congress to serve notice that Federal authorities will not stand idly by and see the seeds of anarchy in America sown across our land by professional agitators using the civil rights cause as a haven.

It is time for Congress to enact strong antiriot legislation and to pass my bill, H.R. 17642, which is identical to the amendment to the Civil Rights Act of 1966 adopted 389 to 25 by the House on August 9. It became necessary to introduce and press for the enactment of this separate bill because of the death of the civil rights bill in the Senate yesterday.

In my opinion, Congress will be derelict in its duty if it does not act in this national crisis before adjournment. The sentiment of the country was clearly expressed in the House vote on the Cramer antiriot amendment, and the House Judiciary Committee should immediately report the bill out. I have asked the chairman to call the bill up for action immediately.

The seriousness of the situation has been evidenced by the insertions in the Record by myself and many other Members and by the number of antiriot bills, identical to mine, which have been introduced. It is further emphasized by the following articles:

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune,  
Sept. 9, 1966]

## THE REAL SNICK

Atlanta's race riot Tuesday is a prime example of the deliberately inflammatory conduct of some Negro leaders—and also how far out of touch these men are with the real desires of members of their race.

For the outbreak which lasted 18 hours during the afternoon and evening and left 16 injured, damaged several cars, and brought almost 70 arrests, was touched off by a false cry of "police brutality" after a white policeman shot at and wounded a fleeing Negro suspected of car theft.

Stokely Carmichael, the bellicose provocateur of "black power," quickly moved in, and sent a sound truck into the area to pass the word that the Negro had been shot to death while handcuffed to the policeman.

Yet a U.S. Senate study released just this week, based on surveys of Negroes in the "ghetto" areas of Watts, Harlem, Chicago and Baltimore, indicated the average Negro lives in a condition of near-anarchy which he deplores. Instead of being concerned with "police brutality," what he wants is much more police protection from a tyrannical



minority; instead of bussing his children into white areas to end "de facto" segregation, he wants better schools—and better housing—where he is.

That such thoughts would never occur to Carmichael, the head of the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee, is shown by the chronology of events in Atlanta Tuesday.

The Negro suspect, Harold Louis Prather, was shot at 1:10 p.m. as he fled Detective R. H. Kerr's attempt to arrest him. Prather staggered to his mother's home, where within five minutes a mob of 200 Negroes formed to prevent his arrest.

Kerr called for help; by 1:30 p.m. 50 policemen had dispersed the crowd and Prather had been sent to a hospital. At 1:45 Carmichael arrived, fresh from a demonstration at City Hall. By 2 p.m. two of his Snick aides brought in a sound truck, plastered with Carmichael's "Black Panther" symbol; by 2:15 the truck was cruising the area asking Negroes to come to a street intersection to give evidence of Snick's version of the shooting—that Prather had been shot while handcuffed.

By 3 o'clock the truck was at the intersection and taking statements. At 4 Carmichael returned to lead a demonstration of about 200 Negroes shouting "Black power, black power." Fifty policemen—all Negroes—arrived at 4:21 to control the crowd; they were met by a barrage of rocks, stones and bottles. Fifty more policemen were called, and the growing crowd was brought under control but refused to unblock the intersection.

The crowd grew to 600, and resisted the pleas to disperse of Mayor Ivan Allen Jr., who, when he attempted to speak from the top of a car, was toppled from it by rioters who rocked the vehicle. At 6 he ordered the street cleared; police dispersed the mob with shotgun blasts fired in the air and with tear gas. By 6:30 the area was cleared, but sporadic overturning of cars and other disorders continued until 10:30.

Does this kind of thing represent the wants of Negroes the Senate Subcommittee headed by Sen. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF of Connecticut, found in its survey (conducted by trained local Negroes)?

No, in Harlem and Watts especially, and in smaller degree in Chicago and Baltimore, the prime need cited by the Negro residents was for stopping crime in the streets. In none of the four areas, when they were asked for a listing of the ghetto's worst problem, was "police brutality" even mentioned. In Harlem, the study found, the primary complaint was inadequate numbers of police, in Watts, of a failure of police protection.

But if Stokely Carmichael and his black power cohorts continue using false accusations of police brutality as a rallying cry for disorder, their effect can only be a breakdown rather than an improvement of police protection wherever Snick operates.

We think Senator Ribicoff's committee study is a genuine reflection of the real wants of a vast majority of Negroes everywhere. And we think, too, that Atlanta Police Chief Herbert Jenkins reflected the real Snick in his assessment of it after Tuesday's riots.

"It is now the Non-student Violent Committee," he said. "We must and will deal with it accordingly." The responsible Negroes for whom the Ribicoff study speaks will do well to deal with Snick in like manner.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Times, Sept. 12, 1966]

#### BLACK POWER WITH A RED BASE

Black power met its match in Atlanta last week. Its prime spokesman, Stokely Carmichael, has been jailed and Carmichael's Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) is under condemnation from liberals and conservatives alike. A residue of violence and bitterness lies in the wake of Snick's activities, but the organization now

is generally recognized for what it is by most people in Atlanta.

Carmichael can claim the support of only a handful of Atlanta Negroes. The rest, including Julian Bond, have turned their backs on him. Bond earlier this year was refused a seat in the Georgia Legislature because of his ties to Snick and statements critical of the war in Viet Nam.

Ralph McGill, liberal publisher of the Atlanta Constitution, has charged Snick with a Jekyll and Hyde personality. He recalled the organization's role in freedom marches as involving some "of the sweetest, bravest people of those days." While we might not agree with that assessment, we certainly can support Mr. McGill's conclusion that "SNCC is no longer a student movement. It is not now a civil rights organization. It is openly, officially committed to the destruction of existing society."

The Atlanta publisher, writing in his front page column, suggests that Stokely Carmichael's black power may, in fact, be Red.

He recalls that last fall SNCC was broke, down and out. But suddenly it had money to burn. And what Ralph McGill calls "the sweetest, bravest people" were replaced by the likes of New York attorney Victor Rabinowitz, registered in Washington as an agent for the Castro government.

In civil rights circles, reported McGill, it is said that Havana money took over Snick. That hasn't been proved but it is true that Snick demonstrators are found shouting Castro slogans.

If Ralph McGill's information is correct, Snick and its troublemakers represent something more serious than a simple riot in the name of civil rights. This is a case of insurrection and should be treated as such.

The Federal government has been patient far too long with professional agitators who travel from state to state whipping up emotions in the name of civil rights. Strong sentiment for an end to this activity is evinced in the words of a Northern congressman, Rep. WAYNE HAYS, Ohio Democrat. He told fellow House members Thursday, "Carmichael and his anarchist group belong behind bars and the quicker we get him there the better off this country is going to be." HAYS said that if there is a law against crossing state lines to incite riots, Attorney General Katzenbach should enforce it.

The quick action taken in Atlanta to douse fires lighted by the Carmichael crowd should set an example for the rest of the nation. There has been some timidity, some hesitation on the part of police in other cities to enforce law and order in race riots out of fear of being labeled "brutal." But mob brutality has become so rampant in this country that any force exercised by police to quell a disorder will win more praise than condemnation.

No one, white or colored, need fear police "brutality" if he is tending to his own business and obeying the law. But those who try to impose their will by force invite force in return.

This opinion is shared not only by conservatives who long have deplored violence in the streets. Liberals such as Atlanta's Ralph McGill who supported the freedom marches now are beginning to sense the danger of continuing contempt of the law and rights of others. Concluding a recent column, he warned, "If (SNCC) is out to destroy society, it cannot expect society to remain passive under attack."

There is even a liberal "white backlash."

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune, Sept. 9, 1966]

#### MILITANT NEGRO LEADER PREACHES WESTERN CIVILIZATION MUST GO

(Under Stokely Carmichael, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee has

done a dramatic about face since the days when it helped thousands of Northern white students to fight for civil rights in the South. Last week, Carmichael stumped Northern cities and found receptive audiences in Negro districts. Here's a comprehensive report on his message as developed on the tour and previously.)

(By Austin Scott)

NEW YORK.—The applause within the Harlem church was frequent, almost deafening. Even from the street, through heavy wooden doors closed to keep out whites, cries of "that's right," and "preach, brother," could be heard.

But many of the remarks tumbling rapidly from the lips of the slender young Negro behind the pulpit microphone were sharply at odds with the religious setting.

"This country is moving to destroy black people," he shouted to waves of applause. "We cannot afford to be part of the American system. . . . We have to destroy Western civilization. . . . Integration is just a trick bag. . . . Nothing counts but power. . . . We have to hook up with the people of the third world. . . ."

The bundle of thoughts that 25-year-old Stokely Carmichael hurled at his listeners also included a great deal of love—love of black people for themselves, their families, their communities, their culture.

But despite his statement in an interview July 6 that black power does not mean anti-white, love was clearly reserved for non-whites.

"We got to start loving ourselves because we are black," he said. ". . . we don't have to lose our blackness to become equal with white savages. . . ." his cheering audience rocked the wooden floor with stamping feet.

On his first extensive tour of Northern slums as chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, handsome young Stokely Carmichael found a receptive audience for "black power," his battlecry for Negro militance and self-determination.

He said shortly after he was elected in June that civil rights movements "weren't even talking to black people in the ghettos but were in fact gearing their programs to what white liberals thought should be done.

"For once," he said, "we've gotten enough strength to talk to our black people who need to be talked to. Everybody in the country talks about them. No one talks to them." That's what he is trying to do.

His Harlem audience happened to be a fund-raising rally. It might as well have been the cheering crowd in Jersey City, N.J., the night before, or the standing-room only crowd in a stuffy, second floor room in Newark, or the thousand Negroes who blocked a Philadelphia street.

Trinidad-born, but raised in Harlem and the Bronx, Carmichael is one of the new SNCC leaders whose roots are in the valleys of the big cities, not the dusty villages of the rural South.

While his radical statements catch the headlines, they are by no means all that Carmichael is trying to say to "black people"—he shuns the word "Negro," using it as a term of derision.

He preaches that Negroes must analyze the world around them, must understand the workings of both foreign policy and the white businessman next door, must save their money and use it to help themselves.

And, as he promised shortly after becoming head of SNCC, he tries to rally black people around the issue of their color.

"Black people in this country are oppressed for one reason," he said early in July, "and that's because of their color. . . . their rallying cry must be the issue around which they are oppressed, as it was for unions."

He hammers at the theme: Black people must "come together," young Negroes must

stop "cuttin' each other on Friday and Saturday nights," older ones must stop "hustlin' off each other," unemployed must stop "drinkin' that cheap rotgut wine and that cheap whisky."

"We have to develop in our community such love and such respect for each other that every mornin' it's gonna be good mornin', brother, good mornin', sister," he told the audience in the heart of north Philadelphia's slums.

And in Harlem, "... we've got to say to our little . . . children, you're beautiful. With your black, nappy hair and your broad nose and your diaper hanging, you're beautiful. We've got to say it to ourselves."

Such statements bring waves of applause, even from Negroes who admit that much of what Carmichael says scares them.

"I don't go along with him on Viet Nam," said a middle-aged mother at a Newark rally, "but he's right on this. We got to come together."

An animated speaker who leans toward his audience to drive home points—alternately shouting and whispering in a heavy Negro dialect he reserves for speeches—Carmichael delivers essentially the same message everywhere, varying it to encompass local problems.

Although he once said black power has to involve white cooperation at some level, his speeches now do not hint at cooperation. "We have to understand," he says, "that we are going to build something they are out to destroy."

"This country is antiblack, and we must be against the things they're for."

His line of reasoning is similar to that of the late Malcolm X. Carmichael says Malcolm influenced him greatly.

Carmichael often starts with a statement that there is no difference between black people in African colonies and Negroes in the United States, because white men are exploiting both.

"Our friends are going to be the people who are fighting to destroy Western civilization," he said in Philadelphia. "We've got to hook up with our nonwhite brothers across the world because they are fighting a system that oppresses and exploits them, the very same thing we are fighting."

"They must become our brothers. So we can't fight in Viet Nam if we wanted to, because our brothers are trying to get rid of the man and it's our job to help them bring the man to his knees."

The argument follows a line which Carmichael said earlier would be a psychological vehicle for black people, but would not be intended as a call to take over the country.

Asked several months ago whether he saw nonwhites coming together to become a dominant segment of the world's population, he said:

"... The reality is that Western civilization has dominated this world ruthlessly, but that in all the emerging nations in Africa, when the Africans took over you saw no white signs and no colored signs. You haven't seen white people excluded anywhere . . . nobody in SNCC wants to take over this country. He wouldn't know what the hell to do with this monster. We just want to get white people off our backs."

Once Carmichael has outlined his reasoning, he outlines the methods he thinks Negroes must use.

Instead of civilian police review boards, "which we aren't going to control anyway," he suggests ending alleged brutality by making "the captains of our precincts responsible to us . . . you can bet we'll end brutality."

He often says everything in a Negro community should be controlled by its residents.

"You are 52 per cent (of the city's population), he shouted to an audience in Newark. "There's no reason why you can't have a black mayor, a black school board, a black

city council. Then you can tax hell out of these white businesses and get the money you need . . ."

To a Harlem audience he said:

"We have to control our communities . . . Harlem belongs to us. It is ours. We should not only rule it, we've got to own it, lock, stock and barrel."

"We've got to move to keep our resources in our community." We can't even accept their nonsense about the individual. We can't afford to let one black man own a store in Harlem and put that money in his pocket and move into the suburbs . . . we've got to have a group of people own that store and use the profits to develop our community!"

To gain such control, he recommends third political parties, like the Black Panther party he helped organize in Lowndes County, Ala.

"Nothing else matters in this country but who controls," he says, and then to illustrate his point, he adds:

"Two weeks ago, the Agriculture Department made a survey and found out that the chain stores like A&P and Safeway charge more money for rotten food in ghetto areas."

"They just found out, and we been knowing that all our lives. And they tell us looting can't accomplish anything."

"They been building a new store every single day with the money they looted from us all these years:

"It ain't looting that's the issue, it's who has the power to make their looting legal . . . we got to talk about power!"

Understanding Carmichael is sometimes complicated by statements which he says should not be taken at face value, since, he insists, he is not talking to whites at all.

"They're building stores in Cleveland with no windows," he told a Harlem audience. "I don't know what they think they'll accomplish. It just means we have to move from molotov cocktails to dynamite."

Asked if he should be taken literally, he shook his head no.

"I think black people know what I'm talking about," he said.

Asked if he cared about white reactions to such statements, he replied, "No, we can't care anymore . . . because I think to care is to say what white people want you to say, would be to accept the solutions they suggest. And we can't accept them. And you don't have to explain to black people what you mean."

Carmichael moves easily through the Northern ghettos. Dressed sometimes in a neatly-pressed business suit, sometimes in an African toga, he wanders through audiences, clasping strangers warmly about the hands and arms, hugging antiwhite post-playwright Leroi Jones and other people he knows.

Graduated from Howard University with a degree in philosophy, Carmichael said he admires, in addition to Malcolm X, Dr. W.E.B. Dubois, the Negro writer who helped found the NAACP, and then broke with it because, he felt, it was too moderate.

Carmichael, who is not married, considers home the Bronx apartment where his mother and two sisters live, although he is on the road most of the time.

Sometimes, as in Newark, Negro politicians feel he is important enough to bring them out to his rallies.

"He's got it, baby," said one young woman in an audience where most of the spectators who appeared to be 35 or older did not join the applause. And Carmichael added his own appraisal:

"We've got some black youth out here whose eyes are opening up wide," he said. "He (white officials) can deal with the man over 30, but he's got hell on his hands under that (age)."

## CRAMER CALLS FOR TAX CREDIT LAWS TO HELP CUT TEACHER SHORTAGE AND ENCOURAGE TRAINING

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to clarify Internal Revenue laws and regulations to permit teachers to deduct from their gross income any proper expenses for educational purposes relating to teaching activities.

The announced intention of the Internal Revenue Service to deny a teacher as a business deduction the costs of acquiring better qualifications through further education and training is beyond my comprehension. Encouragement to better education is being provided through Federal action on many fronts. It is unconscionable that in the one area where encouragement, through the simple device of tax deductions, is an obvious need and could be accomplished through an enlightened interpretation of existing law, the Federal bureaucracy is saying "No."

Teachers who largely spend their own money for training, and who are as dedicated in their work as the members of any profession, should be encouraged in every way possible to constantly increase their knowledge which they so effectively impart to America's youth.

It is imperative that the most competent and well-trained teachers be attracted to our Nation's educational systems and that they be given every incentive to gain knowledge of new techniques and rapidly increasing and developing subject matters.

Business deductions are generously permitted for most businesses and I know of no more important business than that of training and developing the thinking of America's youth. One of the noblest of professions is that of instructing and teaching. This is a vital "business"—and one in which the people of the United States are in constant competition with the rest of the world—one which makes the dream of America work through mentally, physically, and morally developing our fellow citizens to exercise to the maximum their individual initiative, and to use their God-given inherent abilities in service to their families, their home, their country, and their Redeemer.

I call upon Congress to enact this legislation immediately and I include the text of the bill for information purposes:

H.R. 17757

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to trade or business expenses) is amended by redesignating subsection (f) as



(g), and by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

**"(f) CERTAIN EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES OF TEACHERS—**

**"(1) IN GENERAL.**—In the case of a taxpayer who is a teacher during the taxable year or who was a teacher during any of the four preceding taxable years, and who attended an institution of higher education during the taxable year, the deduction allowed by subsection (a) shall include the ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred by him during the taxable year for—

**"(A)** tuition and fees required for his attendance at such institution, for courses for academic credit pursued by him at such institution or for an academic degree;

**"(B)** books, supplies, and materials required for courses for academic credit pursued by him at such an institution or for an academic degree; and

**"(C)** traveling expenses (including amounts expended for meals and lodging other than amounts which are lavish or extravagant under the circumstances) while away from home attending such institution.

**"(2) EDUCATIONAL TRAVEL.**—In the case of a taxpayer who is a teacher during the taxable year or who was a teacher during any of the four preceding taxable years, the deduction allowed by subsection (a) shall include the ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred by him during the taxable year for travel while away from home (including amounts expended for meals and lodging other than amounts which are lavish or extravagant under the circumstances), if—

**"(A)** academic credit is given for such travel by an institution of higher education, or

**"(B)** such travel is accepted by the taxpayer's employer in satisfaction of educational requirements set by such employer or by the State in which the taxpayer is employed as a teacher.

**"(3) DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this subsection—

**"(A)** The term 'teacher' means an individual who is employed as a classroom teacher at an educational institution, or as a supervisor, administrator, advisor, or consultant in any capacity related to the instructional program of such an institution (including but not limited to guidance counselors and librarians).

**"(B)** The term 'educational institution' means an educational institution as defined in section 151(e)(4).

**"(C)** The term 'institution of higher education' means an educational institution which is authorized to confer baccalaureate or higher academic degrees.

**"(4) EXCEPTIONS.**—

**"(A)** Paragraphs (1) and (2) shall not apply to any expense paid or incurred by the taxpayer prior to the time he first performs services as a teacher.

**"(B)** Paragraphs (1) and (2) shall not apply to any expense paid or incurred by the taxpayer for the purpose of obtaining, or qualifying for, employment other than as a teacher."

**SEC. 2. DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME.**—Section 62(2) (relating to definition of adjusted gross income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

**"(E) EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES OF TEACHERS.**—The deduction allowed by section 162(f) for the educational expenses of teachers."

**SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### A NEGRO ASTRONAUT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from

California [Mr. BURTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion as we take pride in the accomplishments of our space program and our astronauts now in space. I am prompted to place in the RECORD an editorial by the San Francisco Sun-Reporter entitled "A Negro Astronaut."

It is difficult to believe that man, who can conquer space, who can walk among the stars, remains fettered by bias and racial discrimination.

It is inconceivable to me that the accumulated wealth and knowledge of this Nation can lift man into the heavens yet find him so impoverished in spirit and earthbound by prejudice that a youth who happens to be Negro cannot meaningfully aspire to join in the conquest of space.

I share the concerns which are stated in this editorial, as I share the belief that a Negro astronaut can and should be a participant in this great adventure, whose presence would be proof that in conquering space, we have first conquered bigotry and prejudice in our own earthbound existence.

The editorial follows:

#### A NEGRO ASTRONAUT

Yes; some time ago we thought perhaps a Negro astronaut would be included among the heroes of the space age by going into orbit and perhaps landing on the moon. It may be remembered that there was a young Negro who was in training along with his fellow astronauts, but something happened that took him out of the space program. He said at the time that it was racial bias that removed him, but this was denied by space officials.

American youth are led to believe their possibilities are without limit, but young Negro Americans almost never think that it applies to them. Today, however, the increasing pace of civil rights and integration have given Negro youth more hope for a better tomorrow. A Negro astronaut out there in space would tremendously enhance the Negro image in America and throughout the world. Such an event would also have, with intense subtlety, a great impact upon the African nations.

Yes; let us have a Negro astronaut. The black man can be super, too.

#### THE BANK MERGER ACT AMENDMENT OF 1966 HAS COMPLICATED AND CONFUSED THE LAW

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, 1966, I opposed the Bank Merger Act amendment which was being debated on the floor of this House. The proponents of the act stated that it would remove the banks from the strict application of the antitrust law. There were

other reasons given in support of the measure, but the antitrust law aspect was stressed.

In my speech of February 8, I pointed out that the language of the amendment was so vague and uncertain that objectionable as the stated purpose of the bill was, it would not even accomplish what its proponents claimed for it. I stated:

This bill will not do what the proponents think it will do. It will not settle what they believe to be questions in the law. . . . This bill raises more questions than it answers. There is only one place where these questions can be finally resolved, the courts.

So in passing this bill we are not settling anything. The language is too vague to settle anything. We are merely laying the predicate for the next round of litigation. And the Supreme Court will have to be asked to tell us what we meant when we enacted the abomination we are passing today.

The observations I made about this bill have now been fully validated. The Department of Justice has placed one interpretation on the antitrust implications of the amendment, in complete variance with the proponents.

The September issue of Banking, the Journal of the American Bankers Association, in an article, "Congress, Justice—and Mergers," clearly demonstrates this wide difference of opinions over what we did when we enacted the bill.

To repeat what I said last February, the new confusion in the law created by the 1966 amendment will have to be resolved by the courts. Passage of the bill was a disservice to the banks as well as the public.

With unanimous consent I am inserting a copy of the article from the September 1966 issue of Banking:

(NOTE.—Here are the comments of several Congressmen on the Justice Department's apparent belief that Congress did not mean what it said in the Bank Merger Act of 1966. In Banking's August issue a similar comment from Representative WILLIAM B. WINDALL (R., N.J.) appeared.)

#### CONGRESS, JUSTICE—AND MERGERS

SENATOR WALLACE F. BENNETT

The Justice Department interpretation that the Bank Merger Act can be used to apply the antitrust laws to banks with more force than before is surprising to me only because it is in direct opposition to what I consider to have been the intent of Congress in the enactment of the Bank Merger Act amendments earlier this year.

The Department has been charged with a responsibility and it is expected that it would attempt to interpret any legislation in such a way as to give it maximum authority.

I was a member of the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate when the 1960 Bank Merger Act was passed. We intended at that time that banking factors be considered at least equally along with the anticompetitive effects that might be a result of a merger. This was upset by the court and it was the specific intent of the amendment passed this year to restate the original desire of the Congress, in light of the court decision.

The legislative history and background along with the language of the amendment should leave no doubt that it was the intent of the Banking Committees of both Houses as well as the majority of the members of both the House and the Senate that bank mergers should be judged by special stand-

ards in which consideration must be given both to competitive factors and to the convenience and needs of those to be served. Even though competition may be substantially reduced, mergers may still be approved if the convenience and needs of the community clearly outweigh the anticompetitive effect.

The Attorney General suggested amendments during the consideration of the legislation that would have made his power stronger, as they are now claiming it is. It is significant that the Congress turned down the Attorney General's recommendations in passing the amendment.

It may well be that the courts will be required again to interpret the language of the amended Bank Merger Act, but I think that the intent of Congress in passing the amendments needs no interpretation.

#### SENATOR JOHN SPARKMAN

The Justice Department has attacked a new merger by two Philadelphia banks, one of the first mergers approved under the new standards set forth in the Bank Merger Act Amendments of 1966. In its pretrial brief the Justice Department argues both that the new law "does not affect the applicability of the antitrust laws to bank mergers"—that this case "is *U.S. v. Philadelphia National* all over again, only that the names have been changed," and that "the antitrust laws apply not only with equal, but more force, than before."

The Justice Department overlooks Section 3 of the 1966 law, which specifically authorizes the two Philadelphia banks whose earlier merger was thrown out by the Supreme Court to reinstitute their application and have it acted upon under the new standards of the new law without prejudice by reason of the earlier proceedings. It is not often that Congress specifically overrules a Supreme Court decision. Section 3 makes it clear that the 1966 amendment does so.

The Department of Justice, in a letter dated May 18, 1966, opposing a proposal to insert the same provisions in the Bank Holding Company Act Amendments of 1966—adopted by the Senate by a 64 to 16 vote—admitted that "Congress . . . passed the 1966 Bank Merger Act amendment in order to assert a Congressional intent that bank mergers should not be treated in exactly the same way as other mergers."

The basic issues here are clear. I commented on them at greater length than space now permits in the July 1965 issue of *BANKING*.

Banking is a highly regulated industry, because of its relation to our money supply and the growth and development of our entire economy. We cannot ever again permit the paralysis of business and commerce which resulted from the wave of bank suspensions in the early 1930s. Under the dual banking system banks cannot spread across the country like industrial firms. Bank charters, bank branches, bank mergers, interest on deposits, bank investments, and bank reserves are strictly regulated. Searching bank examinations enforce these regulations.

Like other regulated industries specifically exempt from Section 7 of the Clayton Act, banks have been required since 1960 to get permission to merge from Federal regulatory agencies, and approval of the merger could only be granted after consideration of both competitive and banking factors with the final result depending on the public interest. The 1960 Bank Merger Act reflected a clear Congressional intent not to apply to banking the harsh rule of Section 7 of the Clayton Act that the demonstrable benefits of a merger are irrelevant. This was what the Supreme Court did in the 1963 Philadelphia case when it rewrote the statutes passed by Congress and held that all "anticompetitive

mergers, the benign and the malignant alike," were prohibited.

The Supreme Court's refusal to follow the Congressional intent led the Congress to amend both the Bank Merger Act of 1960 and the antitrust laws so that a single standard would be applied to bank mergers. The new provision requires careful consideration of competitive factors by the banking agencies and the courts, but it does not stop with the competitive factors. They are not to be controlling. The new provision specifically authorizes a merger which might substantially lessen competition if its anticompetitive effects are "clearly outweighed in the public interest by the probable effect of the transaction in meeting the convenience and needs of the community to be served."

#### REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS L. ASHLEY

From all indications, the Department of Justice has chosen to misconstrue the intent of the Congress when it adopted the new Bank Merger Act. In its brief in a Philadelphia merger case, the Department claims that the new act can be used to apply the antitrust laws to banks "not only with equal, but with more force than before." In a previous case, the Department stated that the new law made "no substantial change in the substantive antitrust law" applicable to bank mergers. In plain language, the Justice Department knows better.

It knows, as does anyone who had taken an interest, that the new Merger Act was passed as a result of a surprise decision by the United States Supreme Court in an earlier Philadelphia case holding for the first time that the Clayton Act applied to bank mergers. This was clearly contrary to what Congress understood and intended in 1960 when the original Bank Merger Act was passed.

In the earlier Philadelphia case, the Supreme Court had said:

"A merger the effect of which 'may be substantially to lessen competition' is not saved because, on some ultimate reckoning of social or economic debits and credits, it may be deemed beneficial. . . . [Congress] proscribed anticompetitive mergers, the benign and the malignant alike, fully aware, we must assume, that some price might have to be paid."

Bound by this decision of the High Court, the Federal District Judge hearing the Manufacturers Hanover merger case expressed the resulting law in these terms:

"Thus, the Bank Merger Act would appear to sanction agency approval of a merger, even though it violated the antitrust laws, if, on a balance of all the designated factors, the agency decided that, nevertheless, it was in the over-all public interest. A court however, would be obliged to invalidate a merger found to violate the antitrust laws even though it served the public interest."

The whole purpose of the Bank Merger Act of 1966 was to reassert the basic premise, subsequently misconstrued by the Supreme Court, of the 1960 act, namely, that banking services—furnishing the very life blood of the economy of any community—have a legitimate claim to consideration as being "in the public interest," and must be weighed both by the regulatory agencies and the courts against any diminution of competition which may result from a proposed merger.

Going back to the language of the district judge in the Manufacturers Hanover case, the purpose and intent of Congress in passing the 1966 act was to underscore that part of the statement which in substance reads ". . . the Bank Merger Act sanctions agency approval of a merger, even though it violates the antitrust laws, if, on a balance of all the designated factors, the agency decides that, nevertheless, it is in the over-all public interest."

The Justice Department, presumably considering itself a higher judge, takes the position that a merger must be invalidated regardless of the fact that it is in the public interest if it results in a lessening of competition.

The record is abundantly clear and I am confident that the courts in future cases will look to the intent of Congress rather than the assumed prerogatives of the Department of Justice.

#### REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

The Department of Justice apparently claims that the Bank Merger Act of 1966 can be used to apply the antitrust law to banks, "not only with equal, but more force, than before."

This seems passing strange in view not only of the general language of the 1966 act, but also by the fact that the Congress expressed the fact that it had a contrary intent by legislatively reversing the three bank merger decisions.

#### REPRESENTATIVE RICHARD L. OTTINGER

The claim by the Justice Department in a recent brief, in the Provident National Bank and Central-Penn National Bank cases, that the Bank Merger Act of 1966 applies antitrust laws more stringently and rigidly to banks than before, is certainly a sharp reversal of its position. The Department vigorously opposed the bill while it was being considered by the House Banking and Currency Committee on the ground that we would be emasculating antitrust law application to banks if we passed it.

In point of fact, it was precisely because the Justice Department had been applying antitrust laws to banks too rigidly that the bill was passed. In a number of cases, the Department had moved against mergers of small, nonviable (though not failing) banks on the grounds that merger would quantitatively reduce competition, in situations where the merged bank could in fact provide better competition for its larger-size competitors and provide much better banking services to the community affected. In this type of situation, the committee felt the Justice Department, the regulatory agencies and the courts should be required to consider "the convenience and needs of the community to be served," and this was the major addition.

Other changes were made to restrict the arbitrary power of the Justice Department—not enhance it. The Department was required to bring action against a merger within 30 days or be forever barred from doing so in the future. Previously, the Department could move at any time, years after a merger was consummated—and the merging banks could never have security against such actions. This was frequently used by the Department as a club against merged banks.

The Justice Department, the regulatory agencies and the courts were for the first time directed to use the same rules for judging a merger. The Attorney General was required to advise the responsible regulatory agency involved of his opinion on the merger in advance of determination.

Let's examine the Department's claims, as reported in the press:

"The Department claimed that under the new laws a court is 'required' to use the antitrust laws in judging bank mergers." That's the truth, but not the whole truth. The court is required to use the antitrust laws but it is also required to weigh them against the convenience and needs of the community to be served. If the former is clearly outweighed by the latter, the court is required to approve the merger despite its antitrust law findings.

The Department claims the burden of proof rests on the banks and regulatory agencies to prove the overriding effect of the



convenience and needs of the community to be served. The statute, however, is silent with respect to burden of proof.

The Department noted the bill provides "specifically" that any action brought under the antitrust laws arising out of a merger transaction shall be commenced within given time limits, and it concluded thereby that we intended that future banks should be subject in the future to antitrust suits. That's certainly true, but I fail to see how it furthers the Department's argument. The committee never purported to be abolishing the application of antitrust laws to banks—we just sought to abolish their misuse and misinterpretation.

The brief used the requirement that anti-competitive effects are to be "clearly outweighed" by convenience and needs of the community to be served to make its case that we intended to strengthen antitrust application. The Department has been moving against mergers, and the courts ruling against them, despite clear showing that better service would result—indeed, there were specific rulings that improved service to a community could not be used at all to offset diminution of competition. The legislative history clearly shows the intent of the committee to reverse this situation.

#### THE COMMITTEE'S INTENTION

The fact of the matter is that the Bank Merger Act of 1966 was passed to overturn the Supreme Court decision in the Philadelphia case which, in the view of the majority on the committee (of which I was one), misinterpreted the Bank Merger Act of 1960 by excluding consideration of the "banking factors" therein enunciated. This is made completely clear in the legislative history and is further borne out by the provision of the act conclusively presuming not to have been in violation of the antitrust laws any merger consummated prior to the decision in the Philadelphia case. The clear and expressed intention of the committee was to exonerate banks that merged in good faith reliance on the Bank Merger Act of 1960 as interpreted by the committee, to require consideration of the banking factors rejected by the court in that case.

The intent of the committee, in passing the Bank Merger Act of 1966, clearly was to temper application of the antitrust laws to banks as interpreted rigidly in the Philadelphia case, by a requirement that the convenience and needs of the community to be served also be considered by all agencies involved and the courts.

#### MANDATORY PAR CLEARANCE OF CHECKS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the money supply of the United States totaled \$171.1 billion on June 30, 1966. Of this amount, \$133.8 billion, or 78 percent, was in the form of demand deposits at commercial banks; only 22 percent was in the form of currency. In our complex, interrelated, financially oriented economy, it is vital that checks drawn on demand deposits be fully interchangeable with currency at face value. Any departure from this free interchangeability renders our vital payments mechanism defective.

Yet we find that nonpar clearance, an anachronistic throwback to a more primitive period when transfers of funds were costly and time consuming, has persisted in certain parts of the country. Nonpar clearance occurs when a bank fails to pay the full face amount of a check drawn upon it, when that check is presented by mail for payment. The check is "clipped" by an amount representing a fractional percentage of the face value. The innocent recipient of a \$200 check drawn on a nonpar bank may find that his own bank credits him with only \$199.80, for example. The members of the public who are first exposed to this practice find it shocking and repugnant, and rightly so.

Charges to cover the expenses of servicing checking accounts should be levied on the holders of those accounts; these holders enter into agreements with their banks at the time deposits are first made, and any prospective depositor can shop among banks to secure the most satisfactory arrangement. The situation is quite different when the recipient of a check drawn on a nonpar bank is involuntarily assessed, not only to cover the cost of servicing the checking account, but also often to provide additional revenue for the drawee bank.

Fortunately, most commercial banks in the United States clear all checks drawn on them at par. It is clear, of course, that had this not been the case, the public outcry against nonpar clearance would long since have forced an end to the practice. However, as of the end of 1965, 1,492 banks or 10.9 percent of all banks, and 300 additional banking offices, still operated on a nonpar basis. These were all located in 15 States, and were concentrated in 6 States each having over 100 nonpar banks.

The practice of "check clipping" imposes unfair burdens on both the general public and the great majority of banks which do not make such charges but which nevertheless have to act as collecting agents when handling checks drawn on the nonpar banks. A most important reason for outlawing the practice is the burden it places on the efficiency of the check collection processes. Checks drawn on nonpar banks have to be handled separately from other checks and the additional costs of such handling have to be passed on to the payees or absorbed by the handling banks. The question whether collecting banks may lawfully absorb such charges has been given two diametrically opposite answers by the Federal Reserve Board and by the FDIC. The Federal Reserve has taken the position that its member banks may not absorb exchange charges—except in very limited amounts—because to do so would amount to an unlawful payment of interest to their checking account customers. The FDIC takes the opposite position that insured nonmember banks may absorb such charges without limit. The result of these conflicting rules has been to place member banks, the great majority of which are national banks, at a serious competitive disad-

vantage in relation to nonmember banks.

In past public discussions of nonpar clearance, it has become clear that virtually everyone is against the practice except the nonpar bankers themselves and their friends. The economic motivation for the attempt of nonpar banks to perpetuate the practice is evident. According to one study, exchange charges represented about 4 to 5 percent of total operating revenue of nonpar banks in a recent year. However, studies also show that the proportion of total income obtained by nonpar banks from conventional service charges on their checking accounts is well below the same figure for par banks. Moreover, it appears that the proportion of earning assets to total assets was lower for nonpar banks than for par banks. This demonstrates that reliance on securing easy revenue from exchange charges leads to the less efficient use of funds by nonpar banks.

The time has come to eliminate this burden on interstate commerce, this confusion of regulations, and this serious competitive inequality between member and nonmember banks. The most direct way of eliminating it is to make it unlawful for any federally insured bank to pay checks drawn on it at less than par. In view of the longstanding interest of the Congress and the Federal executive department in establishing a universal par-clearance system for checks, it is certainly not unreasonable to ask State banks, as a condition to their receiving the benefits of Federal deposit insurance, to join the great majority of banks with respect to check collection. The practice of charging exchange represents an unnecessary and uneconomic cost to the Nation. In effect, other banks, the business community and all citizens are being taxed to support the practice of a relatively small percentage of banks which are using anachronistic laws to levy unreasonable charges. The inequities in such a situation are apparent.

The proposed bill provides for a transition period of 1 year during which nonpar banks will be able to make up for the loss of exchange charge revenue by placing realistic and competitive service charges on their own demand accounts and also by making more efficient use of their funds.

H.R.—

A bill to require all insured banks to clear checks at par

SECTION 1. Section 18 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828) is amended by the addition of a new subsection (k) as follows:

"(k) Every insured bank shall pay all checks drawn on it at par and shall make no charge for the payment of such checks and remission therefor by exchange or otherwise. For each violation of this subsection by an insured bank, it shall be subject to a penalty of not more than \$100, which the Corporation may recover for its use."

SEC. 2. The second proviso in the first paragraph of Section 13 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 342) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect one year after the date of enactment.

## THE HIGH HOLIDAYS, 5727

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, September 15 and 16, 1966, mark the festival of the New Year in the Jewish religious calendar, Rosh Hashana, the opening of the year 5727, and the commencement of the 10-day period called the high holidays. This period concludes with Yom Kippur, the Day of Atonement, occurring this year on September 24. This is, for the Jewish people, a time for reflection upon the past year, of repentance for things ill done or undone, of good resolutions for the coming year, and for a renewal of hope and joy.

I should like, on this occasion, to extend my greetings and best wishes for the holiday season to my many friends of the Jewish faith and tradition, and to express my grateful appreciation for the great contributions the Jewish people have made and are making to Western culture and to mankind's aspirations for moral courage and intellectual freedom.

The terrible sufferings and the tremendous number of deaths of the Jews under Nazi persecution should be well remembered by us all as a warning of the terrible lengths to which anti-Semitism and other racial and religious prejudice can go.

In this connection, I call to the attention of my fellow Members of Congress, and of the people of the United States of America, the pending proposal that Congress should make it clear to the Government of the Soviet Union that we condemn the persecution of the Jews and urge that Government to live up to its own constitutional guarantees of freedom of religion.

This proposal I have embodied in a concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 177, pending in the present Congress but not yet acted upon. As stated in this resolution—

Abundant evidence has made clear that the Government of the Soviet Union is persecuting Jewish citizens by singling them out for extreme punishment for alleged economic offenses, by confiscating synagogues, by closing Jewish cemeteries, by arresting rabbis and lay religion leaders, by curtailing religious observances, by discriminating against Jews in cultural activities and access to higher education, by imposing restrictions that prevent the reuniting of Jews with their families in other lands, and by other acts that oppress Jews in the free exercise of their faith.

There is little we can do about this tragic situation within the Soviet Union. But I fervently believe that at least we can and should speak out, with the full force of our official position, so that the persecuted Jews of the Soviet Union may know that their sufferings are not ignored and so that the Government of the Soviet Union may be formally brought before the bar of world opinion,

under indictment for yet another violation both of human justice and decency.

I hope and pray that the coming year of the Jewish calendar may bring favorable developments in this and other difficulties confronting the Jewish people, and that the blessings of health, happiness, and prosperity may come to the Jews of America and of all the world.

## THE NEGRO AND LABOR

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, one of the most highly respected veterans in the civil rights movements is Mr. A. Philip Randolph.

One of the most highly respected veterans in the labor movement is Mr. A. Philip Randolph, a vice president of the AFL-CIO and president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.

He, therefore, possesses the best credentials to speak of both movements and their interrelationship. This he has done in a splendid Labor Day broadcast over stations of the American Broadcasting Co. network.

I include Mr. Randolph's comments as a part of my remarks and I commend them to the attention of all of my colleagues:

Eighty-four years ago, in 1882, the Knights of Labor celebrated the first Labor Day in our nation's history. In the wake of the great Civil War, the Knights organized integrated union locals in the South and ran Negroes for public office. Southern oligarchs finally used racism as a weapon to destroy those early southern trade unions.

It is only fitting that we pause today to recall the dream of that early movement. For that dream of a Negro-Labor alliance is even more relevant today than it was 84 years ago.

We must pause also to remember that the modern civil rights movement owes much to the labor movement. Our recent civil rights gains were based largely on the economic progress the Negro registered with labor's help in the 1940's and 1950's. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 and 1965 could not have been passed if the labor movement had not worked around the clock—concentrating its expert lobbying on Congressmen whose constituencies were not substantially Negro. The Negro non-violent movement owes a great deal to Gandhi and Thoreau, but it is also indebted to the American labor movement for much of its techniques—for example, the boycott, mass picketing and most important, the sit-down strike.

Today, thanks to the monumental sacrifices of civil rights workers, the support of labor and religious groups, the Negro has at long last won his juridical rights. But in many areas of the South, he is still too unorganized and too intimidated to use his vote effectively.

He is also too poor to use integrated facilities and too poor to buy homes in newly integrated suburbs. In fact twelve years after the historic Supreme Court decision outlawing segregated schools, more Negro children attend all black schools than in 1954. Moreover, the slums are more dilapidated and

joblessness among Negro teenagers is increasing.

The only institution in this society whose economic programs coincides with the needs of the civil rights movement is the labor movement. Full and fair employment, a higher minimum wage, housing subsidies and democratic economic planning are the answers to Negro impoverishment—and let me add, to white impoverishment as well. They are the basic plans of the AFL-CIO economic program.

The American Federation of Teachers is vigorously organizing Negroes. The AFL-CIO has guaranteed the funds needed to organize the migrant laborer, and the Industrial Union Department has opened community grievance offices in Chicago to help Dr. Martin Luther King organize. Labor's fight for the repeal of 14(b) will help the Negro. In the right-to-work states, not only do Negroes earn less than white workers, but they are falling further and further behind.

In the area of political action, the goals of the labor movement and the civil rights movement are one and the same. When both movements joined hands, Dixiecrats were defeated in Tennessee and Virginia. When they were divided and did not coordinate efforts in Alabama, racist-reactionaries won.

And thus we see that social justice (the objective of the civil rights movement) and economic reform (the objective of the labor movement) have become inextricably intertwined in our lifetime. A separation between organized labor and the Negro struggle can only encourage the growth of reactionary currents in American political and cultural life. Alone, the civil rights movement cannot win jobs, better housing and decent schools. Alone, the labor movement does not have the power to defeat anti-labor legislation and to protect workers' rights.

The Negro-Labor alliance is our strongest weapon against the coalition of reactionary Republicans and Dixiecrats who would deprive the Negro of his civil rights, who would drag organized labor back to the 19th Century and who would repeal social progress. The political power of this reactionary coalition must be shattered. It must be shattered in Congress where the seniority system and the lingering disenfranchisement of Negroes enables it to exercise a stranglehold over Congressional committees. No sooner was Representative HOWARD SMITH of Virginia defeated, than was he replaced as Chairman of the House Rules Committee by an ardent Mississippi segregationist.

It must be shattered on the local level where right-wing groups are launching a reactionary counter-revolution against the civil rights revolution. It must be shattered in the right-to-work states where it perpetuates a permanent depression economy. The reactionary coalition which denies us a substantial minimum wage, which denies us rent-subsidies and which diminishes and demeans the war on poverty, can only be smashed by a strong Negro-Labor alliance. For when the masses of white workers join black workers in the streets and at the polls, we will be well on the way to the democratic political revolution which will free all Americans from minority rule.

We must not only proclaim the need for an alliance, we must prove to the advocates of black power, to the worker who fears for his job and his home, to the depressed and alienated white poor, that progressive social change is possible. We must join in the fight for an end to poverty.

Let me say here that too many Americans are ignorant of labor's role in the fight against poverty, which is the fight for economic democracy. Between 1960 and 1965, after-tax corporate profits rose 67%, as compared with a rise of only 33% in wages, salaries and fringe benefits. Eastern Airlines



alone since 1964 has increased its profits by 100%. Let these facts be borne in mind by those who were outraged by the airline strike and by the final settlement of 6%. I contend that the machinists' strike, which sought to divert enormous corporate profits into workers' wages and fringe benefits, struck a blow on behalf of the war on poverty.

For when wages and salaries lag behind profits, income is distributed upward. Consumer purchasing power falls behind productivity, and the end result is rising unemployment and poverty. In the face of fantastic corporate profits, guidelines which would restrict wage increases to 3.2%, endanger the whole economy and create special hardships for workers at the bottom of the ladder.

This is only one example of how our economic policies contradict the war on poverty. Training and community action programs will avail us little if the wage-profit gap continues to spread. Yet, the 1964 tax cut had an effect of increasing corporate after-tax profits by \$3 billion—more than the cost of the entire federal war on poverty. And still there are those who would tell us that we lack the resources for a war on poverty, that domestic social spending must be slashed because of the war in Vietnam! They would have this war borne upon the bent shoulders of the poor.

I am proud that these voices of reaction are most sternly resisted by the American labor movement—at the collective bargaining table and, when there is no other recourse, in strikes and picket lines.

At the planning meeting for the White House Conference, "To Fulfill These Rights," I proposed a 100 billion dollar Freedom Budget, a massive investment to destroy the slums and eliminate poverty.

The Budget attacks all of the major causes of poverty—unemployment, and underemployment, substandard pay, inadequate social insurance and welfare payments to those who cannot or should not be employed; bad housing, deficiencies in health services, education and training; and fiscal and monetary policies which tend to redistribute income regressively rather than progressively. The Freedom Budget leaves no room for discrimination in any form because its programs are addressed to all who need more opportunity and improved incomes and living standards, not to just some of them.

Let me interject a word here to those who say that Negroes are asking just for another handout and are refusing to help themselves. From the end of the 19th Century up to the last generation, the United States absorbed and provided economic opportunity for millions and tens of millions of immigrants. These people were usually uneducated and a good many could not speak English. Yet the economy could profitably employ them. They had nothing but their hard work to offer and they labored long hours, often in miserable sweatshops and unsafe mines. But the industrial revolution had need of muscle power and immigrants could learn gradually and move up the ladder to greater skills. There were thus economic trends which helped people escape poverty. And then perhaps, the most decisive act of self-help on the part of that older generation was to organize the trade union movement. Unions not only struggled and won collective bargaining rights in the shop, they joined with the middle class of reformists and the religious men of conscience and all partisans of social change.

Today, it is absolutely necessary that we go beyond the games of the past, and guarantee a real right-to-work. For the American economy has become much more sophisticated than it was a generation ago. It needs scientists and engineers much more than muscle power.

Negroes who have been driven off the farm into a city life for which they are not prepared, cannot be compared to the immigrants of old. The tenements which were jammed by newcomers were way stations of hope. The ghettos of today have become dead ends of despair. We must guarantee full and fair employment—it can no longer be a question of pious statements of public intent which lead only to a deeper frustration. Twenty-two years late we must return to the idea of a legal obligatory guarantee of work. There have been too many vague promises.

The President's Commission on automation reported that there are 5,300,000 public service jobs unfilled right now in health education, beautification and the like. One of our top priorities should be training to fill them.

We have just had a debate over extending minimum wage coverage to the poorest of the poor. Opponents of that wage have said that if employers of stoop labor in the fields were required to pay a decent living wage, or if the salaries of hospital employees were raised, these occupations would be destroyed because the employer would be motivated to mechanize. I see no reason why these occupations should be preserved, so long as useful and humane work can be found for those displaced. Let us not treat the unemployed and under-employed as a burden, but as a reservoir of talent, who, if only given a chance, could make this society a better place to live in for all.

I can anticipate arguments which say that this program of massive spending discriminates in favor of the black man or the poor generally. That is not true. It is only the first installment in giving those least able to pay at least the public assistance in housing that we have lavished on the rich.

After World War II, the GI Bill of Rights was instituted to help veterans go to school. It would be a wise social investment to pay the veterans of the ghetto to go to school today. And let us invest so that after we have torn down the slums and built new housing, schools and hospitals, we can fill their shells with teachers aids, doctors, nurses, hospital aids, artists and actors and their apprentices. We can build new towns, but not as hideouts for the white middle class where social problems and responsibilities are ignored. We can plan new towns from the ground up as integrated, productive communities.

We have before us the fantastic potential to celebrate the second century of America's existence by the abolition of ghettos and slums.

And I submit that this glorious dream is possible only if the civil rights and trade union movement work together hand in hand.

#### FEDERAL HELP IN THE RELOCATION OF RAILROAD TRACKS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation calling for Federal help in the relocation of railroad tracks that run through cities and towns and for the construction of railroad overpasses and underpasses.

I believe that this legislation is necessary and timely. Last year, according to the National Safety Council, there were

1,660 deaths due to railroad crossing accidents. There were some 6,000 non-fatal injuries from such accidents.

And if you have ever had the misfortune to be delayed by a long freight train at a grade crossing, you know how inconvenient that can be.

Since most all railroads today are involved in interstate commerce, I believe that the Federal Government has not only the right, but the duty to do something about this danger to our citizens. There is more than a convenience factor involved in railroad crossings being blocked by long trains when an ambulance or other emergency vehicle is delayed unnecessarily. I believe that the savings in human life and suffering will more than offset the cost of this program.

#### THE ATTERBURY JOB CORPS CENTER

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, from time to time in the newspapers I receive from my district I run across articles which I feel are of interest to many persons who probably do not receive these Indiana papers. Recently a series of such articles came into my office.

This series of three articles deals with the Atterbury Job Corps Center and the Job Corps program. It was written by Frank A. White and widely circulated throughout the State in Mr. White's column, "The Hoosier Day." I believe that Mr. White has done an excellent job of looking at the Job Corps program in an objective and factual way. This series of articles does much to dispel the fallacious charges being made by many people in an effort to repudiate and discredit the efforts of the Federal Government and the Great Society programs. I heartily recommend this series of articles for reading by my colleagues—indeed by all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert these articles here as an extension of my remarks:

#### THE HOOSIER DAY

(By Frank A. White)

While a security officer at Camp Atterbury Job Corps Center, was making out a pass, John (Jack) Mehaffey, associate publisher of the Franklin Star, remarked to me:

"We are about to get a first hand look at one of the biggest break throughs of the school drop-out problem, or one of the biggest political boondoggles of our age."

I am aware that if the present rate of school drop-out continues, we will by the end of this year have some 8 million drop-outs in the USA. Also, much of my information about the Atterbury Job Corps had been bad. It ranged all the way from exorbitant cost to the FBI arresting some corpsmen for sex offenses.

We went to see the Atterbury Job Corps project for ourselves. It is my hope, whether you agree or disagree with my observations,

that you go to Atterbury to draw your own conclusions. Two hour tours of Atterbury Job Corps are held commencing at 10 A.M. and 2 P.M. on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Several civic clubs, such as Lions, Rotary and Kiwanis, hold evening meetings there on arrangements that include "Question and Answer" sessions.

It is a "new ball game" throughout for Atterbury Job Corps in this fast moving world. Some of the biggest corporations in the USA have become concerned about the "unemployed" and "unemployable" youths, most of them school drop-outs.

On April 6, last, Westinghouse signed a contract with the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity, for exhaustive study and now has complete administration of Atterbury Job Corps.

Atterbury is a gigantic dormant army camp, erected to train troops for World War 2 and Korea. It is 31 miles south of Indianapolis, in gently rolling, wooded country, approached by a network of modern highways. It is ringed by the towns of Edinburg, Franklin and Columbus, and is but a few hours drive from Louisville.

It totals 40,000 acres, replete with hundreds of 1½ story barracks and buildings, wooden structures, weather beaten, but with premises kept clean and neat. Our National Guard uses it for training purposes and Job Corps men have been building a Vietnamese village for the Guard. With limitations, the State Division of Natural Resources uses part of the camp for hunting deer and fishing.

Poignant memories flooded me at Atterbury. When I last saw it, the camp swarmed with Khaki clad G.I.s. The enormous Wakeman General Hospital, part of the complex, was filled with wounded of World War 2. During the conflict, my G.W. (Good Wife) had charge of working girls who in the evening danced with soldiers under auspices of the USO. Her army of pretty girls was called Liberty Belles. Mrs. Clarence A. Jackson had charge of a counterpart—the Cadettes and the two groups numbered more than 600 girls. There were ghostly memories of the hastily trained 106 Lion Division that went overseas at Christmastide to be slaughtered in the Battle of The Bulge.

Atterbury Job Corps took over the gigantic Wakeman General Hospital. The nearby Nurse Quarters are dormitories now. A sum of 4 million dollars has been spent rejuvenating the buildings. They are newly painted in pastel colors, inside and out, floors polished, and kept neatly.

You can stand in Wakeman and look down a corridor that seems a mile long. Some say there are 13 miles of corridors at Atterbury. The project utilizes other buildings, including a fieldhouse, and gym equipped to handle basketball, wrestling, boxing and other indoor sports. There is a platform stage for movies, indoor TV rooms, outdoor recreation area, including an Olympic sized swimming pool. There is a library.

I was surprised to learn the present enrollment of Atterbury Job Corps is in excess of 1,700 youths. That is as big as a goodly sized college or university. It is anticipated that the enrollment at Atterbury Job Corps will be in excess of 2,400 by November.

No one knows the future of the gigantic Atterbury Job Corps project, but it has been approached with an idea of permanency for training youth.

#### THE HOOSIER DAY

(Second of series by Frank A. White)

Indiana Atterbury Job Corps, with 1,700 enrollees, run by Westinghouse Corporation for the Office of Economic Opportunity, is the second of the gigantic projects of reclaiming school drop-outs and unemployed youth.

The first was at Camp Kilmer, N.J., started when Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara suggested such use be made of surplus army installations.

Enrollees of Atterbury Job Corps come from all 50 states, including Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. The idea is to get these frustrated youths a distance from their home towns, where they have been branded failures. They get a new start.

Under the contract, and before taking over, Westinghouse was allowed to make an exhaustive three months study of Atterbury project. Robert J. Hadden, who now is Job Corps Center Director had charge of 15 men making up the study team.

It enjoyed cooperation of the Midwest Educational Foundation and the Litton Educational Systems Division that had charge in the formative stages. Westinghouse experts from Pittsburgh were rushed in for the study.

There was examination of Job Corps accounting, purchasing, property control, labor relations, employment, maintenance, office services, security and community relations.

Center Director Hadden described the typical Job Corps enrollee as follows:

"Our study showed these young men came from homes of severe poverty. Most of them had never slept between sheets; never had a bed of their own. They had to contend with the law of the streets. Many developed resistance to traditional methods of education.

"Our studies showed: Two out of three Job Corpsmen lived in slum housing; four out of 10 came from homes of families receiving some kind of family public assistance and the breadwinner in more than 60% of the families, chronically suffered long periods of unemployment.

"One out of each two came from a home where the parents had less than an eighth grade education. The average Job Corpsman has not completed the ninth grade of school and reads less better than a fifth grader. Eight out of 10 had never seen a doctor or dentist for their ills.

"These youths were the product of apathy and were failures over their short span of years. We are taking these youths who in 18 years got into desperate circumstances. At Atterbury, in nine months time, we try to raise their literacy, change their bad attitudes toward society, that they may become better, self sustaining citizens. Westinghouse screened staff and teacher corps and let some 56 go. It has now a staff and teacher personnel of 775."

The instruction is such that each individual corpsman has a chance to go as far as his potential in a field in which he has interest.

Vocational classes teach skills in six categories. They are:

- 1) Automotive service maintenance and repair
- 2) Building maintenance, repair and supervisory skills
- 3) Food services and preparation
- 4) Appliance repair skills
- 5) Refrigeration installation and repair and
- 6) Heater installation and service skills.

There are 70 skill levels so that a corpsman can advance to his highest skill potential.

We had an opportunity to meet several of the teachers and craft supervisors in our exhaustive look at operation of Atterbury Job Corps under the new Westinghouse management. Manifestly all were dedicated people. Teachers have quite a distance to come work and long hours. They work 12 months a year instead of nine. They gave up tenure and fringe benefits, as well as teacher pensions.

These teachers and skill supervisors are concerned by enormity of the school drop out problem. They feel Job Corps is a possible solution. They are deeply interested in the project, aimed at remedy of a growing economic and social problem.

#### THE HOOSIER DAY

(Third of a series by Frank A. White)

When Atterbury Job Corps was going through a trial and error period of a new program to reclaim school dropouts and teach them employable skills, I interviewed U.S. Senator BRICH BAYH, Jr., at French Lick. The subject was black headlines in metropolitan papers about Corps Discipline. Senator BAYH said:

"These are not Sunday School kids. If we can't handle them now, we may expect them on welfare and in our prisons for a lifetime."

With Westinghouse, one of our great American corporations taking full management of Atterbury Job Corps, I inquired about the matter of discipline.

For the FBI to move into the Job Corps is not as bad as it might seem. Atterbury Job Corps is on government property. If a Job Corpsman purloins a carton of cigarettes, or punches a fellow Corpsman in the nose, it is an FBI case. For practical purposes, the FBI is the "Town Marshal" of the Job Corps.

There was a serious happening, involving sexual assault, but overall the clashes with the law by Job Corpsmen have been grossly exaggerated. Here is the record.

Of all young men who have been a part of Atterbury Job Corps, since it opened, only 5 percent have violated any law, either at the Center or while on pass. This is below American youth nationally, in the same age bracket. The bad image given the Job Corps does not hold when one faces the facts.

When only Indianapolis arrests are considered, only 2% of all Corpsmen have violated the law.

Of the Indianapolis school population, police estimate 2.7 get into difficulty with the law. In real numbers that is more than 3,000 arrests a year. The total number of Atterbury Job Corpsmen arrested in Indianapolis was 67.

So far in 1966, Indianapolis police records show that of all arrests for the five major crimes, 41.5% involved persons 16 to 18 years of age. Not one of these arrests involved a Job Corpsman, and in fact, of all arrests in Indianapolis involving young people, 97% were persons other than Job Corpsmen.

Westinghouse has established the most elaborate discipline set-up at Atterbury that the law allows. It is working for improvement. Atterbury Corpsmen may be sent home immediately now, awaiting approval of dismissal by Washington. The Corpsmen are worried about what others think of them. They are keenly aware some of their fellow Corpsmen break laws in one way or another, either on the Center or in town, on weekend passes.

There has been much written about the "exorbitant" cost of Job Corps program. The project and concept is costly, nationwide some \$172,000 as of now. It is an attack on a gigantic social problem. Atterbury Job Corps costs \$500 a month per corpsman for a year, or less time at Atterbury.

Westinghouse expects to lower that to \$5,400 a year per Corpsman by June, 1967. The remark it costs as much a year for a Job Corpsman at Atterbury as were he in Harvard, is not the whole story.

Involved at Atterbury is the big sum paid to rejuvenate Wakeman General Hospital and the buildings for trade classes. The Job Corps cost involves equipment, clothing, food, pay and all other incidental expenses, not just Harvard tuition.

Questions are asked as to the pay of the Corpsmen. A Job Corpsman gets \$30 a month basic pay. He must pay his federal taxes. He ends with about \$7 a week, basic pay. This is used for razor blades, cookies, soft drinks and the like. In addition, \$50 for every month that he successfully meets training, an additional \$50 is put in escrow for him, until the date he leaves.



If he has dependents at home, he may assign \$25 of that \$50 per month to them. The Federal government will match this. Where there are dependents, a Corpsman might reach \$105 a month total.

Most Job Corpsmen have been rejected by the Draft. However, they remain under jurisdiction of their local draft board. Of 800 Job Corpsmen finishing training, 34% joined the Armed Forces immediately. Some raised their literacy at Atterbury so they might enlist.

#### TRAFFIC SAFETY: WHY CONGRESS ACTED AND WHAT IT DID

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MACKAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the most murderous Labor Day weekend in the history of the motor vehicle, Congress completed its work on two major safety bills. In this 72-hour period, 636 men, women, and children suffered violent death, and 25,000 experienced disabling injuries.

It was Friday, September 9, 1966, that the President signed into law bills which establish a National Traffic Safety Agency, and nominated the first Traffic Safety Administrator.

We who advocated a national program to build a safer traffic environment throughout the 50 States hope fervently that this new Agency will be an instrument by which we can arrest and reverse the awesome toll of lives being sustained daily.

The following questions and answers disclose why Congress acted and what it did. If we are to build a safer traffic environment, it will take unprecedented concert of action by everyone—public officials and private citizens alike.

#### THE BIG PICTURE

First. Why did Congress act? Death, injuries, and accidents are steadily increasing numerically and in terms of rate per miles driven. For the first time more than 50,000 persons were killed in a 12-month period—July 1, 1965, to July 1, 1966.

Second. Why did Congress define a new Federal role when this problem has been left traditionally to State and local governments? No matter how we look at it, what has been done has not been enough. Highways do not stop at the State line. Better roads, better cars, and the high mobility of people have made the driving environment national in nature. Fifty States cannot fix safety performance standards and no one State can afford comprehensive research.

Third. What specific laws were enacted? The National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966—Public Law 89-563—and the Highway Safety Act of 1966—Public Law 89-564.

Fourth. Who is charged with administering these laws? The Secretary of Commerce is directed to carry out the provisions of these laws through a National Traffic Safety Agency, headed by

an Administrator appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Agency will be transferred to the Department of Transportation if created.

Fifth. In general, what do the laws provide? Mandatory safety performance standards for all new motor vehicles; funds for development and improvement of strong State and local traffic safety programs; and comprehensive research into the causes and prevention of traffic accidents.

Sixth. What new funds are authorized?

Total Federal spending over 3 years of \$381.8 million: \$51 million for setting auto safety standards, \$5.8 million for tire standards, and \$325 million for research and for State and local safety programs. Our losses now exceed \$9 billion per year.

Seventh. How soon can we expect to get going with a National Traffic Safety Program?

The President lost no time in nominating the Administrator. The law requires interim vehicle safety standards by January 31, 1967, and States, counties, and cities can begin now to plan their participation in this new national effort.

Eighth. How soon can we expect to get results?

This will depend on the quality of the leadership of the program, the support given by Congress and State legislatures, and the response of the American people.

#### SAFER MOTOR VEHICLES: MANDATORY SAFETY PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

First. Why should Congress fix safety performance standards? The motor vehicle is the means for about 80 percent of interstate travel and commerce. Fifty State legislatures setting vehicle standards would, as one auto manufacturer put it, create "chaos for the industry."

Second. What vehicles are covered? All new motor vehicles including trucks. Used motor vehicles will be the subject of a report to Congress by September 9, 1967, and standards will be fixed by September 9, 1968.

Third. What is required of manufacturers and what provisions are there for enforcement? They must manufacture motor vehicles with safety features meeting standards established; certify to the dealers that each vehicle and piece of equipment conforms to the applicable safety standards; and notify the purchaser of defects affecting safety and what remedial action is needed.

The laws provides a civil penalty up to \$400,000; injunctive relief; and the power of inspection to evaluate compliance.

Fourth. What are safety performance standards for motor vehicles and when will they go into effect? They are objective, practicable criteria which will provide for greater safety, such as recessed dashboards, collapsible steering mechanism, safety locks and hinges for doors, four-way signals, and so forth. The standards do not include regulations for design or styling.

Interim standards similar to those now required for Government-purchased ve-

hicles must be set by January 31, 1967. Permanent standards must be set by January 31, 1968. Standards must go into effect within 1 year after being set.

Fifth. Who will be consulted before standards are fixed? The law provides a National Motor Vehicle Safety Advisory Council, a majority of which shall be from the general public, and representatives of State and local governments, of motor vehicle and equipment manufacturers, and dealers to advise the Agency. The Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission and other similar State or interstate agencies—including legislative committees—will be consulted.

#### STATE TRAFFIC SAFETY PROGRAMS

First. How will standards for State safety programs be determined? By the Agency after consultation with a 29-member National Highway Safety Advisory Committee, composed of chief executives of States and political subdivisions, highway safety administrators, industry representatives, engineers, research scientists, and members from the public at large.

Second. What will the standards cover? Driver training; effective record systems; accident investigation; vehicle registration, operation, and inspection; highway design, maintenance, and lighting; traffic control; vehicle codes and laws; surveillance of traffic to detect and correct high or potentially high accident locations; emergency services; and other aspects of traffic safety.

Third. What is the theory of the State safety programs? A national safe driving environment can be achieved only to the extent that each State and political subdivision builds its own traffic safety program based on generally uniform criteria. To accomplish State uniformity and coordination, the law requires the Governor of each State to be responsible for the administration of the program.

Fourth. What formula is provided for distributing funds? Seventy-five percent of the funds will be distributed on the basis of population and 25 percent within the discretion of the Administrator.

Fifth. What penalties apply if a State fails to participate? States failing to establish traffic safety programs according to prescribed standards by January 1, 1968, risk the loss of 10 percent of their Federal highway allotment and all funds under the safety program.

#### INVESTIGATION AND RESEARCH

First. Is not the Federal Government conducting traffic accident research now? Yes, but without specific congressional mandate and without much financial support. We spend \$100,000 per victim to discover the causes of airplane accidents, but less than a nickel per casualty on traffic accident research.

Second. What the new congressional mandate for research? The laws direct that there shall be coordinated research, development, and testing on every facet of traffic safety; and investigation and collection of accurate traffic accident data. A decision about new research facilities will be made later.

## OTHER PROVISIONS

The laws include special provision for tire safety standards; an improved National Driver Register; a comprehensive annual report to Congress on all phases of the safety programs; a study of the relationship of alcohol to traffic safety; and authorization for bulletins to citizens providing the latest information affecting their safety on highways.

# CONGRESSMAN FRANK ANNUNZIO'S SPEECH TO THE 761ST TANK BATTALION ASSOCIATION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a speech made recently by the Honorable FRANK ANNUNZIO of the Seventh District of Illinois. On September 3, 1966, Congressman ANNUNZIO had the honor of addressing the 18th annual reunion of the 761st Tank Battalion Association and Allied Veterans of World War II, a distinguished group of Negro-American veterans.

I commend Congressman ANNUNZIO's speech to my colleagues because it tells part of the too little known story of the role of the Negro-American soldier in World War II. The 761st Tank Battalion was the first armored unit in the history of the American Army to enter combat with Negro-Americans manning its weapons and vehicles.

Because of Congressman ANNUNZIO's strong feeling that the gallant war record of Negro-Americans should be given due recognition, he is taking the lead in obtaining recognition for the 761st Tank Battalion. Last June Congressman ANNUNZIO introduced a bill to authorize a Presidential unit citation for the 761st Tank Battalion. I have been proud to follow his leadership in working for passage of this measure before the Congress adjourns.

FRANK ANNUNZIO has a long and outstanding record of fighting for equal rights for all Americans. In 1951 FRANK ANNUNZIO, who was then the Illinois State Director of Labor, issued an order instructing his department to place all job applicants without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin.

He further ordered his department to refuse to even accept requests for the department to refer job applicants if the jobs were not open to all regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin. This initiative on his part won FRANK ANNUNZIO universal praise and numerous awards from various labor, civil rights, and religious groups in Illinois including the Chicago Council on Religious and Racial Discrimination, the Chicago Commission on Human Relations, and the Chicago branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

FRANK ANNUNZIO's voting record during his first 2 years in Congress speaks for itself. FRANK ANNUNZIO voted for the 1965 Voting Rights Act, the 1966 Civil Rights Act, including the fair housing section, and the 1966 Equal Employment Opportunity Act. As someone who was involved in the Mississippi challenge, the effort to deny seats in the House of Representatives to the five members from Mississippi because of massive voting discrimination against Negro-Americans in Mississippi, I particularly remember FRANK ANNUNZIO's votes in support of the Mississippi challenge on two separate rollcalls in 1965.

Congressman ANNUNZIO's speech to the 761st Tank Battalion and his efforts on the unit's behalf are consistent with his long record of working to advance the cause of equal dignity for all.

The speech follows:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE FRANK ANNUNZIO BEFORE THE 18TH ANNUAL REUNION OF THE 761ST TANK BATTALION ASSOCIATION AND ALLIED VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II AT THE GRAMERCY INN, WASHINGTON, D.C., SEPTEMBER 3, 1966

It is an honor and a pleasure for me to be here tonight at the 18th Annual Reunion of the members of the gallant 761st Tank Battalion and Allied Veterans of World War II.

I want to welcome all of you to the Nation's Capitol, and to express my particular appreciation to Mr. Richard A. Carter, your national president and a resident of the 7th Congressional District of Illinois which I have the honor to represent, for inviting me to your banquet this evening to speak to the 761st Tank Battalion Association and Allied Veterans of World War II.

It is with real pride that I address all of you because of the outstanding contributions you made during World War II which led to the ultimate victory of the Allied forces. You gave your blood and your lives in the service of your beloved America, and the certificates of merit, the purple hearts, the silver stars, the bronze stars, and the commendations awarded to you are overwhelming evidence of your courage and your bravery. A total of almost 400 battle awards and the high praise of the War Department were bestowed on the men who served with the 761st Tank Battalion. You compiled a truly impressive record and you are a credit to the more than 20,000,000 Negroes of America. The example you have set is one which the younger generation of America can follow with respect and pride.

As you know, the 761st Tank Battalion was the first armored unit in the history of the American Army to enter combat with Negroes manning its weapons and vehicles. The Battalion was activated in April 1942 at Camp Claiborne, Louisiana. General Leslie J. McNair was the one who first conceived and advocated the idea of Negroes in the Armored Forces. Many were at first opposed to the idea, but General McNair won out. Orders were issued to organize the first Negro Tank Battalion in our history. Unfortunately, General McNair did not live to see the tremendous success of the project he initiated for he died in the bombing raids over Normandy, France, in 1944.

In October 1944, after two years of concentrated effort to build an effective fighting machine, the 761st Tank Battalion landed in France on the Normandy peninsula. The momentous day had arrived, and true to their battle cry, the brave boys of the 761st "came out fighting!"

In their first encounter with the enemy, the 761st took three towns from the Germans. The Battalion lived up to the highest

expectations. The men fought gallantly in extremes of climate and terrain. Their ingenuity and ability carried them through the grimmest and most difficult situations.

In December, 1944, after the 761st had been in combat less than two months, the Commanding General of the Headquarters XII Corps issued an official commendation. In a special memorandum to the Commanding Officer of the 761st Tank Battalion, Major General M. S. Eddy, stated:

"I consider the 761st Tank Battalion to have entered combat with such conspicuous courage and success as to warrant special commendation."

"The speed with which they adapted themselves to the front line under most adverse weather conditions, the gallantry with which they emerged from their recent engagements in the vicinity of Dieuze, Morville le Vic, and Guebling entitle them surely to consider themselves the veteran 761st."

It is a matter of record that in the Battles of Morville, Metz, Obreck, Dieuze, Guebling, Tillet, and countless others, the men of the 761st conducted themselves admirably under stress and the relentless fire of the enemy.

You will recall vividly, I know, the rugged fighting at Tillet, the heavy casualties sustained by both sides, and finally, the retreat of the crack German 13th SS Panzer Division as the 761st pushed forward and turned the tide.

Such moments as this should not be forgotten. Courage and bravery of this high caliber deserves to be remembered. Indeed, the pages of American military history would not be complete without official recognition of the 761st Tank Battalion, which fought with valor in France, Belgium, Luxembourg, Holland, Germany, and Austria.

It was through the suggestion of my good friend, Honorable Vito Marzullo, the distinguished Committeeman and Alderman of the 25th Ward, that your president, Mr. Carter, first wrote to me about his efforts to secure this recognition for the 761st Tank Battalion.

I was delighted to have the opportunity to be of service, and immediately conferred with Congressman L. MENDEL RIVERS, the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, about the introduction of legislation to honor your Battalion. Then, on June 15, 1966, only eight days after I had received Mr. Carter's letter, I introduced H.R. 15715 to authorize and request the President of the United States to award a Presidential Unit Citation to the 761st Tank Battalion.

Subsequently, I wrote to Chairman RIVERS, and urged that early action be taken on H.R. 15715 in order that it may be enacted into law prior to the adjournment of the 89th Congress.

On August 29, Chairman RIVERS replied to me as follows:

"In accordance with the rules of the Committee, your bill was referred to the Secretary of Defense for his views and recommendations on June 17, 1966. We are awaiting this report and until it is received, no action can be scheduled on the proposal."

The Chairman also assured me that I would be furnished a copy of the Defense Department's position as soon as it is received. I want to assure all of you here tonight that I shall continue my vigorous efforts to secure enactment of H.R. 15715 in order that the extraordinary heroism of the 761st Tank Battalion may be officially recognized.

I would like to say in closing that the Negroes who served in World War II and in particular those who served with the 761st Tank Battalion made not only a magnificent contribution in the defense of our Nation, but also made a profound, more significant contribution to the social advancement of our great country.

Once and for all the shining example of the 761st broke down all barriers and all



myths about the American Negro. It demonstrated beyond any doubt the true potential of the American Negro and led to national recognition of his worth as a responsible citizen and asset in our society.

Negroes have always distinguished themselves in the service of our country. Five thousand Negroes fought in the Revolution and this led to the emancipation of Negroes in the North. Three thousand Negroes fought in the War of 1812 and this resulted in the enfranchisement of the Negro in many Northern states and the beginning of a strong movement for general emancipation. Four hundred thousand Negroes fought in the Civil War and this resulted in the emancipation of 4,000,000 Negroes and the vote was given to all of them. Ten thousand Negroes fought in the Spanish-American War, and more social and economic gains were made by the Negro. Over four hundred thousand Negroes fought in World War I and more than five hundred thousand fought in World War II.

The record of loyalty and courage of the American Negro to his country in time of war and peace is unbroken. Yours was not the first page in that record, but it was one of the most glorious pages written in American military history.

I shall do my utmost to insure that your contribution is officially recognized, and if hearings are scheduled on my bill to authorize a Presidential Citation for the 761st Tank Battalion, I plan to personally testify before the Committee in order to make the officials in Washington aware of the magnitude of your contribution during World War II.

I know that you will continue in the future, as you have in the past, to live up to the great traditions you have established in the service of democracy and of America.

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you so much for your kind attention this evening.

#### BAD ADVICE ON NATO NUCLEAR POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] for 15 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time in order to discuss briefly a proposal made by a group, which calls itself the Educational Committee To Halt Atomic Weapons Spread, and the statement of the committee which purports to speak for 290 citizens, including 12 Nobel Prize winners, which was carried in today's New York Times.

According to the Times story, these citizens feel that the imminent spread of nuclear weapons among nations which presently have no such weapons is a greater danger than events in Vietnam.

They take note of the approaching visit to this country of the Chancellor of West Germany, Mr. Erhard, later this month, and urge the President, prior to the Chancellor's arrival, to modify the position which he has so wisely taken in negotiations at Geneva for a nuclear nonproliferation agreement.

Under this position the United States has insisted upon the right to cooperate with NATO nations in order to establish

a NATO nuclear force, which, of course, hopefully would include West Germany.

The 290 citizens who have joined together in urging modification of this position by the President are quoted as follows. They define the "obstacle" to a nonproliferation pact as "the unresolved issue of U.S. sharing of ownership and control of atomic arms with West Germany" through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I shall place the text of this article: PRESIDENT GETS ATOM PACT PLEA—290 LEAD- IN—CITIZENS URGE U.S. PLEDGE NOT TO SHARE WEAPONS WITH BONN

(By M. S. Handler)

Two hundred ninety citizens, including 12 Nobel laureates, warned President Johnson yesterday that the "imminent spread of atomic weapons among non-nuclear powers, by manufacture or acquisition," represented an even greater danger to the national security of the United States than the Vietnam war.

In a statement and an accompanying letter to the President, they stressed the urgency of removing the chief "obstacle" to a treaty with the Soviet Union to prevent what they described as the imminent spread of nuclear weapons to nonaligned and neutral powers.

The "obstacle" was defined as the unresolved issue of U.S. sharing of ownership and control of atomic arms with "West Germany" through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

#### LETTER SIGNED BY EDUCATOR

The letter was signed by Dr. Arthur Larson, director of the Rule of Law Research Center, Duke University Law School, in his capacity as chairman of the Educational Committee to Halt Atomic Weapons Spread. It said:

"We venture the judgment that it is in order now for the United States to adopt a firm policy, making it unequivocally clear, that it will not share its exclusive veto over the ownership and control of nuclear weapons with any other power, through NATO, or in any other form, so that Chancellor Ludwig Erhard may be so informed upon his arrival in the U.S. and so that renewed negotiations can begin with the Soviet Union with a prospect of agreement."

The West German leader will arrive in Washington Sept. 25 for talks.

The letter asserted that "before world events foreclose the opportunity, it is imperative that new initiatives should be undertaken to secure a treaty."

According to the committee's statement, "five nations already have their hands on the nuclear trigger."

Sixteen nations stand in the wings, trying to decide if they must produce their own atomic fire to escape the role of hostages of the nuclear powers," it said.

"Twelve of these countries have the scientific and industrial capacity to produce nuclear weapons within three years. Three of them could do so within months, it is believed. Fifteen of these countries are either neutral, nonaligned or allies of the West. One is a member of the Soviet bloc."

The five nuclear powers are the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, France and Communist China.

According to Dr. Larson, India, Israel and Sweden are technologically equipped to start production of nuclear weapons within months should their governments decide to proceed.

He also said that West Germany could be included in this category.

Japan, he said, has the industrial plant and the technological skills but has so far shown very little interest in nuclear weapons.

The Soviet bloc country referred to in the statement as capable of producing nuclear weapons is believed to be either East Germany or Czechoslovakia.

The statement advised the President that "the next weeks could well be decisive."

#### DISTINGUISHED NAMES

The 290 signatories included distinguished figures in science, education, religion, business, law, labor, arts and public affairs.

Among them were:

Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, Provost of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and a special assistant to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson on science and technology; Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky, professor of chemistry at Harvard University and a Presidential special assistant for science and technology from 1959 to 1961; Conrad Alken, author; Edward Albee, playwright; Dr. A. Doak Barnett, professor of government at Columbia University and a leading China scholar.

Dr. John C. Bennett, president of the Union Theological Seminary; Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, General Secretary-Elect of the World Council of Churches; Dr. May I. Bunting, president of Radcliffe College, and the Very Rev. Gerald J. Campbell, S.J., president of Georgetown University.

The letter and statement to the President were prepared and drafted by the Committee, which has its offices at 345 East 46th Street. Dr. Larson and several of its members met with the press yesterday at the Plaza Hotel to answer questions.

#### SOVIET SEES LOOPHOLE

"West Germany," the statement said, "is enjoined from manufacturing nuclear weapons but not from acquiring them under the terms of its admission to NATO. The U.S.S.R. interprets Article 1 of the U.S. draft (treaty) as providing a loophole whereby Germany, through a NATO nuclear multilateral force, will acquire and share control of atomic weapons."

The United States favors a nonproliferation treaty, the statement said, but it is also concerned with the desire of the Germans to share in control. It is this unresolved conflict over priorities that, the statement asserted, created the present deadlock.

"The President must decide which of these objectives should be paramount," it said.

Citing a Presidential statement that the United States seeks a treaty "void of any loopholes which would permit nuclear or non-nuclear powers to proliferate, directly or indirectly," the statement said that "it is our hope" the President would give greater importance to a treaty than to sharing atomic weapons with Germany or any other non-nuclear power.

#### THREE STEPS URGED

The letter and the statement urged President Johnson to make the following decisions immediately in the interest of obtaining a treaty:

"To affirm that the U.S. will not give up to any other power its exclusive veto over the ownership, control and use of U.S. nuclear arms through NATO, the European theater or anywhere else.

"To revise the U.S. draft nonproliferation treaty to reflect this decision in language which is clear and unequivocal.

"As a signal of its new approach, to name a top-level delegation to meet with ranking Soviet diplomats, at a time and place of mutual choice, and authorized to seek an early agreement on a nonproliferation treaty."

To convince the non-nuclear powers that their own security would be enhanced by such an agreement, the signatories proposed the following collateral measures:

Collective assurances of assistance be given by the signatory nuclear powers to the non-

nuclear powers against nuclear attack or threats of attack.

Undertakings to strengthen the United Nations peacekeeping machinery and other international security arrangements.

"Affirmation of U.S. willingness to negotiate a treaty banning atomic weapons testing underground, possibly for a trial period only, with inspection by challenge and invitation."

The signatories warned that "once the door to the nuclear club has been opened, it may not be shut again."

"Without a nonproliferation agreement, the direction of U.S. policy over the past 20 years to halt the nuclear arms race will be reversed. It is imperative, therefore, that we get down to the business of signing such an agreement."

Speaking on behalf of the signatories yesterday, Dr. Larson said:

"The spread of atomic weapons to non-nuclear countries is the most severe threat to American security today."

"Experts in diplomacy, science and defense agree on this. But, partly because of the obsession with Vietnam, and partly because of the difficulty of dramatizing the danger of nuclear spread, the level of public knowledge and concern is astonishingly low in proportion to the importance of the issue to the safety of ourselves and our children."

#### MULTIPLE DANGER SEEN

The spread of nuclear weapons among a great number of powers was viewed as a multiple danger to American security.

It would precipitate an expanded nuclear arms race and compel the United States to augment its own nuclear arsenal to keep its lead, it was believed.

Secondly, the spread of nuclear weapons would presumably multiply in many areas of the world the dangers of war that today are kept in check by the overwhelming American nuclear capacity.

Finally, it was believed that proliferation would diminish the ability of the United States to maintain and enforce the peace.

An Educational Committee, Dr. Larson said, was formed to bring the problem to public consciousness.

"Never was timing so vital, to an issue," said Dr. Larson.

"The world desperately needs and wants at this moment the reassurance of its own sanity that a nonproliferation treaty would afford, and the United States needs this opportunity to prove its capacity for leadership toward global security in the nuclear age."

Mr. Speaker, the statement includes this astonishing comment:

We venture the judgment that it is in order now for the U.S. to adopt a firm policy, making it unequivocally clear, that it will not share its exclusive veto over the ownership and control of nuclear weapons with any other power, through NATO, or in any other form, so that Chancellor Erhard may be so informed upon his arrival in the U.S. and so that renewed negotiations can begin with the Soviet Union with a prospect of agreement.

The full text of their statement to the President, as reported on page 12 of the Times today, includes this statement:

Members of both Houses of Congress oppose any U.S. sharing of nuclear weapons.

Now, the statement of course does not say that all Members of both Houses of Congress oppose sharing, but the implication left by this statement is that it is virtually unanimous on the part of Members of both Houses of Congress that simply is not true.

This would be a good moment for us to review our relationship of recent years with West Germany.

West Germany became a part of NATO in a dark moment in European history when the threat of Soviet attack was more apparent than it is today. West Germany chose to "put in with us," so to speak, and from that day to this West Germany has been a trusted, valued, and dependable ally of the United States.

West Germany is the only one of the 15 nations in NATO whose military forces are fully committed to NATO. All of its military forces are committed; that is, assigned and operational under NATO command, and in no other form. As a practical matter, West Germany does not have military forces today as a nation; it has these forces only as they are a part of the NATO military command.

West Germany under its constitution is forbidden to develop and manufacture nuclear weapons on its own soil. This does not preclude West Germany, of course, from acquiring them from other sources and actually owning and operating them. To this date there is no indication, no detectable sign, that West Germany wants to have its own national nuclear weapons which it can control, and yet for years the leadership of West Germany has made it plain that Germany must have the assurance of nuclear protection in this nuclear age. Under present circumstances it must rely entirely upon the commitment of the United States, under which we are pledged in the NATO treaty to come to the aid of other NATO nations, including West Germany.

The assumption is that we will use nuclear weapons to protect German homes just as we would protect our own. This was the massive retaliation doctrine under President Eisenhower.

But under Secretary McNamara this doctrine has been modified to such an extent that it is simply no longer enough. Instead of the massive retaliation doctrine, we have the theory of flexible response. Upon this Germans today must depend for protection against attack from the Soviets.

West Germany has been very patient. West Germany is a competent nation, one with a history of technological achievement and progress. I think reviewing that background and reviewing the facts of life as they exist today, West Germany has been very patient and forbearing in its present second-class status within the NATO alliance.

What this committee proposes is that the United States foreclose for all time any possibility that West Germany could ever have any part in owning or sharing the control of any nuclear weapons for its own defense. This is a slur against a dependable ally, especially the new generation which had no involvement whatever in the Nazi era.

To me this committee proposal goes in exactly the wrong direction. Instead of cutting off Germany from the possibility of participating with the rest of the NATO nations in establishing a NATO force in which Germany could

have a part in developing policy, in selecting the command system, a force which hopefully would not be subject to the veto of any nation, we would indeed be moving in the wrong direction.

We should be trying indeed to establish such a NATO nuclear force instead of foreclosing it for all time.

I would like to point out to this body that the assertion of this committee to the effect that Members of both Houses of Congress oppose any United States sharing of nuclear weapons is indeed misleading. On June 1, I was authorized to speak for 21 of my colleagues in presenting a statement to the European Subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

At this point in the RECORD I ask unanimous consent to place the text of this June 1 statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The text of the statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE PAUL FINDLEY, (REPUBLICAN, OF ILLINOIS); TO HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE ON EUROPE

In making these remarks I am authorized to speak for: E. ROSS ADAIR (Ind.), JACKSON E. BETTS (Ohio), WILLIAM E. BROCK (Tenn.), CLARENCE J. BROWN, Jr. (Ohio), DON H. CLAUSEN (Calif.), THOMAS B. CURTIS (Mo.), EDWARD J. DERWINSKI (Ill.), ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH (Kans.), JOHN ERLBORN (Ill.), JAMES R. GROVER, Jr. (N.Y.), CHARLES GUBSER (Calif.), RALPH HARVEY (Ind.), ROBERT MCCLORY (Ill.), ROBERT MCEWEN (N.Y.), CHESTER MIZE (Kans.), ALBERT H. QUIE (Minn.), HOWARD W. ROBISON (N.Y.), HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI (Pa.), WENDELL WYATT (Oreg.), J. ARTHUR YOUNGER (Calif.).

News reports which were forced last week to inside pages by Vietnam headlines told of shocking European developments which could wreck NATO completely unless the United States acts quickly.

This was the news: for the past year France and the Soviet Union have been working together in nuclear research, and joint ventures in space are now being negotiated.

The world's largest accelerator, being completed near Moscow, will be open to French scientists. For their part the French will provide the world's largest "bubble chamber" for the observation of high-energy particles.

The French team will be the largest group of foreigners to work with Soviet researchers.

What are the implications?

Most obvious, France will press forward with nuclear weapons development. From research to weapons development is only a step. This should surprise no one, as it is entirely natural for any nation to develop the best possible weapons for its own national security. It was unrealistic for anyone to expect France, Germany or any nation with a tradition of scientific and aeronautic achievement, to refrain indefinitely from nuclear and space development.

France's nuclear research will be done in close collaboration with the Soviet Union. Both have much to gain. France gains access to advanced nuclear technology long denied it by United States policy. The Soviets get the use of unique French scientific achievements but more important may gain a way to circumvent the test-ban treaty.

France did not sign the test-ban treaty and has islands in the Pacific where nuclear devices will soon be tested. The Soviet Union did of course sign the treaty, but a working relationship with France would enable the Russians to get their nuclear devices tested



above ground without themselves openly violating the treaty.

The Soviets have more to gain than just technological development.

The collaboration gives them an effective new way to pursue their obvious objective of fomenting trouble within the Atlantic Alliance.

It will further encourage the separation of France from NATO, already far advanced.

It will establish a new European partnership interested partly in keeping the Germans forever from acquiring nuclear weapons, and thus it will feed new fires of discontent within Germany.

Is it realistic to expect a nation like Germany whose scientists pioneered in rocketry and atomic fission to forgo permanently the most effective military weapons? Have the Germans not accepted with patience and grace a second-class status for an entire generation after the war?

As the memory of Hitler fades it would be natural for the Germans like the French to rebel against a policy which treats them as untrustworthy and irresponsible. That day will be hastened by the new French-Soviet arrangement. Germany will be impelled to make its own deal—with the Soviets or others—to advance what appear to be its own national interests.

All this could have been prevented.

Three years ago the House Republican Committee on NATO warned that United States policy on nuclear weapons was outmoded and bound to cause trouble within the alliance. That shortsighted policy denied to our allies weapons we knew the Soviet Union possessed. At that time our Committee recommended that tactical nuclear weapons be made available to NATO nations.

The factfinding mission to Paris sponsored last June by the House Republican Conference proposed that the United States recognized the fact that France, like it or not, had become a nuclear power and we should start cooperating to the end that the nuclear capabilities of the two nations be fully coordinated. This could have been done without amending the Atomic Energy Act. The mission also proposed that steps be taken to create a "true partnership" within NATO in nuclear technology and weapons control.

Why did France turn to the Soviet Union? Was it because the United States has actively resisted all French efforts to develop nuclear weapons? Was it because we turned a deaf ear to French complaints about the NATO military structure? To a shocking extent U.S. policies have driven France into the arms of the Soviet Union. The latest in a long series of affronts was our Administration's refusal to export computer equipment France wanted for its weapons technology.

Curiously, the United States has acted as if the best allies are those which are individually weak, disarmed and dependent. Never let them have any big weapons of their own. Goodness, no! They can't be trusted. Be lord high protector for them all, and everybody will live happily ever after. Nationalism is wrong for everybody but ourselves.

This policy was doomed to failure. It ignored the natural needs and pride of every progressive nation.

Our commitment to NATO was based principally on nuclear deterrence—that is massive and immediate atomic retaliation. While this is officially the NATO doctrine and still theoretically in effect, it has actually been abandoned by the Supreme Command in favor of the concept of flexible response. Never approved by the NATO Council, flexible response became the de facto NATO doctrine when it was propounded by Secretary McNamara in a speech at the University of Michigan. The result of this was to seriously undermine the credibility of our NATO commitment. Today, how many people

really believe President Johnson would press the nuclear button—thus risking destruction of U.S. cities—in order to protect Europe? Even if he would, has he convinced our allies?

The automatic character of our commitment to defend other NATO nations further came into question recently in the disclosure of correspondence in 1964 between our President and the Prime Minister of Turkey. In it, President Johnson warned that the United States might have to review its defense commitment if Turkey's planned action in Cyprus provoked Soviet attack. The language he used was curiously similar to De Gaulle's recent use of the words "unprovoked attack" in describing his interpretation of the Alliance's automatic commitment.

Recognizing the key importance of France in the Atlantic Alliance, the Republican Committee more than a year ago urged President Johnson to go to Paris for the single purpose of visiting the French President.

At this late hour, can anything be done to save the alliance from further fragmentation?

A personal trip to Paris by President Johnson still might salvage NATO, if he were prepared to discuss specific proposals which would assure NATO-wide cooperation in technology of all sorts—including nuclear matters, as well as a partnership system for making alliance policy and carrying it out, and a joint arrangement for handling world-wide matters like Vietnam.

President Johnson is the ex-officio leader of the alliance because present circumstances center all of its real authority in his hands. He alone controls the nuclear weapons on which all NATO nations depend. He personally selects the supreme commanders of the alliance. Therefore, he alone is in a position to bring about effective reforms quickly. He must act, or nothing of consequence will happen.

President de Gaulle is an astute diplomat, and this current scientific venture with the Soviet Union may actually be a move intended to bring forth a revamped NATO. If President Johnson goes to Paris with specific proposals to discuss, the mad rush toward fragmentation of the alliance could be reversed.

Even if President de Gaulle does not react favorably, much could be gained. Reform of NATO is essential no matter what course France may pursue.

In any case, does the clear responsibility of alliance leadership give the U.S. President any choice but to go? Our pride must not be permitted to stand in the way. The stakes are high, and a touch of humility might be helpful.

At the least the trip and the proposals would re-establish a basic but long neglected principle: our NATO allies should be as militarily strong and self-reliant as possible.

Until a better arrangement can be devised, we must aid our allies, individually and collectively, in acquiring the weapons and technology they feel are essential to their security.

Mr. FINDLEY. This statement, in which I was joined by 21 Republican Members of the House, lamented the nuclear policy of the United States toward France, in recent years, which actually in our view tended to drive France out of the alliance and into the arms of the Soviets for nuclear matters.

We stated that this new technological arrangement between France and Russia will further encourage the separation of France from NATO and will establish a new European partnership interested partly in keeping the Germans from forever acquiring nuclear weapons and thus will feed new fires of discontent within Germany.

I fear that if the President should take the advice of this committee mentioned earlier, and modify the very correct and wise attitude which his representatives have displayed in negotiations on a nonproliferation agreement, he would seal the fate of NATO. He would be planting seeds which will quickly flower into a monstrous development which would deal Germany out of NATO, such as France has been dealt out of NATO.

And, this most essential of our allies would fall apart. That happening, we would have a far greater danger of national proliferation of nuclear weapons than we do today. We can expect all nations to do their best in self-defense and in this era of nuclear defense, national defense necessarily requires nuclear defense.

Mr. Speaker, this thought is expressed in the final paragraph of the statement signed by 21 House Members on June 1, to which I referred earlier. I quote directly from it:

Until a better arrangement can be devised, we must aid our allies, individually and collectively, in acquiring the weapons and technology they feel are essential to their security.

Mr. Speaker, somehow, we have got to keep our priorities in the proper order. Seeking agreement with the enemy camp; namely, the Soviet Union, the heartland of communism, on some flimsy type of agreement which could have no meaning whatever, must not be our top priority. Our first priority must be to make our friends strong, hopefully through NATO, but if need be, individually.

#### REPORTING TO CONSTITUENTS ON THE 89TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATTEN). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] for 30 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, this is the 14th consecutive year since I first came to Congress and have had the responsibility to report to my constituents on my service as Representative of the First Congressional District.

Right now, as in a speech to the University Lions Club earlier this week, I have attempted to avoid partisanship. For example, in discussing the 89th Congress I could not overlook Vietnam, and here is a case where Republicans like myself in Congress have refused to play partisan politics on this vital issue. After all, Republicans in Congress such as myself have given full support to the Johnson administration. We have applauded efforts to secure a negotiated peace. We have said that the President had no other course than to prosecute the war.

At times, naturally, as I told the Lions Club, individuals—including myself—have felt impelled to differ and offer specific criticism.

For example, on a number of occasions, I have urged that the American people be given the full and true facts. I have asked, without being fully informed, how could the American public

properly evaluate the President's decision to counter the increased intensity of North Vietnam's oppression? How could public opinion react fairly and wisely when the United States changed policy and sent its aircraft to attack the larger petroleum depots near Hanoi and Haiphong?

Actually, the American people reacted favorably, but they should have been forewarned that this action was made necessary by a substantial increase in the infiltration of armed men and war supplies from North Vietnam into South Vietnam, made possible by the increased petroleum products mostly furnished by Russia.

They should have been previously forewarned of the fact that enemy truck movements had doubled during the first 5 months of 1966. They should have been previously forewarned that the daily tonnage of supplies moved overland from North Vietnam had increased 150 percent and personnel infiltration had increased 120 percent during 1966 to date, compared with the 1965 average.

It was petroleum that made this possible. As the August 29 issue of the U.S. News & World Report expressed it:

Progress of the Vietnam war is one thing when measured by Washington. It's something different—and less encouraging—when measured at the scene.

So, as I say, I do not think the American people have had the full facts, and I have felt free to say so. We have had managed news. What is more, the McNamara-Pentagon propaganda machine at times has deliberately misinformed the public.

The Vietcong have modern weapons obtained from Red China—delivered by two railroad lines to North Vietnam. These railroads, until recently, were off-bounds as air targets. And the network of waterways and canals—controlled by three locks, carrying bumper-to-bumper barges full of supplies to our enemy—are too. I question whether these three locks that make this traffic possible should be off-bounds as air targets. I have felt free to question the limitations on these and 250 other targets that are off-bounds to our bombers.

Let me emphasize that deescalation of the war, on both sides, not just ours, could best be accomplished by curbing the delivery to the enemy of strategic war material, and not just by more air attacks on military, noncivilian targets. I have strongly urged stronger economic sanctions on free world nations whose ships carry strategic cargoes to North Vietnam. I favored a firmer air attack policy to slow down the enemy's fighting and step up the chance of peace talks. I believed such a policy would reduce U.S. casualties.

But, in general, I support, and my party supports, the Johnson policy. Let me make that clear. Here is an important point I want to emphasize. Ho Chi Minh is watching our forthcoming elections. He has been telling his people—and professes to believe—that the United States is ready to quit. Radios in North Vietnam broadcast this line and statements by Democratic Party leaders

such as Senators MORSE and FULBRIGHT, who urge immediate capitulation to the Communists.

As I say, Ho Chi Minh knows the majority party is divided; he knows the war is not popular; he knows we are beset with internal strife; he knows that in practically every political contest for Congress, as in my own First District, the peace candidates are campaigning for a pullout from southeast Asia.

Throughout the free world, as well as the Communist world, foreign leaders such as De Gaulle denounce America. Our war is not popular abroad and it is not popular in America.

So, as I say, Ho Chi Minh is not interested in peace talks. He expects candidates for Congress such as myself, who support the President, to be defeated. Then he won't have to negotiate with anyone. He will take over South Vietnam. America, he thinks, will capitulate.

Whereupon, the Communists will start their aggression in some new area. Thailand will be next. And then in another spot, until communism controls all of Asia.

So, this election is not a matter of a doormat or a blank check Congress, or of a Great Society with rent supplements and a guaranteed income for all—although these, too, are vital issues.

The November elections could well—with the election and reelection of Members of Congress like myself who favor getting in and winning the war—be a step toward peace.

If Ho Chi Minh, next November 8, gets the word that the United States is not going to quit—gets it straight from the ballots of the American people—he may change his tune. After all, he knows Red China wants Vietnam weary and weakened by a long war, to drop into China's hand like a ripe plum. So, Ho Chi Minh is watching the outcome of the November elections with more than casual interest.

Meanwhile, apart from Vietnam, there is not much comfort for us in the rest of the world. Things are not going well for us in other parts of the world, either.

This is the first time in the history of America that she has fought for freedom without free world support. We have failed even to persuade the free world to stop trading and aiding our enemies.

NATO is divided and disintegrating. Hardly a day goes by without an American Embassy or a library being stoned or burned and our flag insulted.

America goes on pouring its wealth into underdeveloped countries. There have been some successes, but in general, the population and mouths to feed increase faster than we can dole it out.

At home meanwhile we face spiraling inflation and possible devaluation of the dollar, due to the continuing flight of gold abroad. Our dollar is in jeopardy and many economists say that if remedial action is not taken, we face a serious depression.

The Nation's monetary gold stock is at the lowest level since 1938. At any time lack of confidence in the stable value of the dollar could precipitate foreign

claims to convert their dollars into our gold. We do not have sufficient gold any longer to settle these claims, and the only alternatives would be repudiation or devaluation.

In order to maintain confidence abroad and discourage conversion of claims to gold, the buying power of the dollar must be firmed up and inflation curbed.

I do not need to repeat here that many of us in Congress have urged less domestic spending as the best means of accomplishing this objective. The minority party throughout the 89th Congress has sought to reduce appropriations and reduce spending of money we do not have for things we do not need. However, in effect, we have a one-party Government, and while we Republicans make fine speeches about waste and unneeded expenditures in domestic programs, that is about as far as it goes. We do not have the votes.

Recently, Dr. Arthur F. Burns of Columbia University, a distinguished economist, suggested that among other steps which might be taken to control economic activity, a stretchout of Government spending on nondefense construction projects would be advisable. Likewise, he suggested that our foreign aid be trimmed and our troop commitments in Europe be reconsidered.

As to the problem of inflation, as I told the University Lions Club, I personally feel this situation, serious as it is, could well change after the November elections. In the House, often, the margin of votes on spending bills or attempts to reduce the cost of programs has been slim. For example, the new rent subsidy program funds carried by only four votes. By only two votes, the House defeated an attempt to reduce the 2-year foreign aid authorization to 1 year.

It could well be that the rubberstamp complexion of the Congress could change after November. And frankly, I look for a Congress next year which will demonstrate more independence and integrity.

There is one domestic problem which deserves special mention. Right now the homebuilding and selling industry faces a major crisis which adversely affects millions of Americans. In short, absence of mortgage money has resulted in the building permit rate dropping 18 percent nationwide, as against last year. Applications for FHA-insured loans on existing homes are down 34 percent.

Throughout the country, newly married couples find it difficult to buy homes. On the other hand, people who need to sell their homes find it hard to obtain buyers who can finance the purchase; builders and workers in home construction are affected and affiliated industries are suffering and, of course, our important lumber industry is feeling the pinch.

Homebuilding and selling is the second largest industry in the Nation. Building is vital to the economy and even more so in the Pacific Northwest. I believe immediate steps must be taken to ease money for home loans and the needs of small business. Republicans in Congress are unified as to this situation.

Recent statistics show housing starts are approaching a new low of only 1



million units per year, which shows that our national homebuilding industry faces a major crisis. Actually, the trend of industry has been pointing in this direction for more than 2 years.

Homebuilders from across the country have been asked by their national association to support a bill to limit interest ceiling on bank certificates of deposit in order to release funds which they feel have been diverted from the housing market. This diversion has occurred, but the primary cause lies in actions of the Federal Government in the money market.

Specifically, the statutory ceiling of  $4\frac{1}{4}$  percent on long-term Federal debt has forced the Treasury, in its debt management operations, to compete with private enterprise in our short-term money market—simply because they could not sell long-term obligations within the ceiling.

Second, due to the balance-of-payments problem, the U.S. Treasury had undertaken to keep short-term rates up and long-term rates down. This, too, has had an adverse effect on the money market, and particularly upon those industries such as homebuilding, which are extremely credit sensitive.

Third, this administration not long ago rammed a bill through Congress, allowing so-called participation sales. The purpose of this bill, the Participation Sales Act of 1966, was to allow the Government to sell certificates of interest in Government assets and to use the money on additional programs without having to include these funds in the budget. It was nothing more than a device to reduce the coming year's budget. More importantly, however, it means that again the Treasury is competing with private enterprise to the extent of some \$3 billion-plus in the short-term money market. During congressional debate, administration supporters assured us that these participations would not cost more than one-fourth of 1 percent more than current Treasury financing costs. As many of us stated at the time, this statement was away off. Participations are now selling to yield better than  $5\frac{3}{4}$  percent.

I must report, Mr. Speaker, to my constituents back home that all of these factors have served to dry up funds in an already critically short money market. In addition, these factors undercut efforts of our Federal Reserve System to allow a money supply which is consistent with economic growth but which would deter inflation. The supply of money is up some 6 percent over last year. Federal Reserve credit outstanding is up over 9 percent. However, due to the economic boom of the Vietnam war, and Treasury operations, loan demand is up 14 to 15 percent. The result is that homebuilding, which is so vital to my congressional district, has been hurt.

From a more positive point of view, Mr. Speaker, I have supported other alternatives. For example, I supported a bill to increase Fannie Mae borrowing authority by more than \$4 billion.

Also, I, and other Republicans, supported the removal of Fannie Mae's \$15,000 loan limitation. I, and other Re-

publicans, urged that further participation certificate sales be suspended. I, and other Republicans, asked for a slash in nondefense, nonessential domestic spending—and many Democrats agreed. We urged a reduction in point discounts in connection with FHA and VA home financing. And finally, I strongly supported the idea of an Emergency Committee on the Homebuilding Crisis. There is no excuse for delaying until after the November elections for constructive action on this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the main cause of the stringency in money for loans is the swollen budget of the administration in Washington. By the same token, I believe the main cure lies in cutting excessive spending on new domestic programs.

Incidentally, I still think that the Republicans in the House had a sound plan when we came out with a program to reduce spending without trying to eliminate programs. I refer to the attempt of the minority Members of the House to amend appropriation bills by reducing the overall amount allowed by 5 percent. This simply provided that Government agencies could effect economies wherever they felt it could be done. It would be entirely up to the President to eliminate waste and decide what should be done in the way of economy, without any meat-ax cut.

But we did not have the votes to put this plan into effect. Just 5 percent off of each appropriation total would have curtailed Federal spending by about \$5 billion—and no one program would have been adversely affected by the cut.

In conclusion, it is always a privilege to report to my constituents. Members of Congress cannot get home as often as they would like, but when the opportunity comes, I was happy to be invited to address a group such as the University Lions in Seattle who represent the backbone of America. In doing so, I trust I was truly objective and that criticism was not motivated by partisan politics.

Again, in closing, Mr. Speaker, I say it is an important duty to report to the people back home, and this year especially so.

#### NINTH ANNUAL STEUBEN PARADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATTEN). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO] for 10 minutes.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, September 17, 1966, on Fifth Avenue in the city of New York, will be held the ninth annual Steuben parade, sponsored by the German-American Committee of Greater New York. This parade is taking its place in the history of New York City beside the St. Patrick's Day parade and the Columbus Day parade as "institutions."

It is fitting that the Steuben parade, commemorating the birth of Baron Frederick Wilhelm von Steuben, falls on our own Citizenship Day. General von Steuben contributed so much to our Na-

tion in our fight for independence that his name is almost synonymous with U.S. citizenship. All Americans, not just those of German ancestry, should and do honor this man who served our own Gen. George Washington so diligently and faithfully.

In honoring General von Steuben we pay tribute to all German-Americans who have contributed so much to this Nation. I am proud to have a large community of these patriotic people in my congressional district, and I am proud to call them my friends.

Saturday, September 17, will be a happy day in New York, and I extend to all an invitation to join in these festivities on Fifth Avenue which commence at 2 p.m., daylight saving time.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HICKS (at the request of Mr. ADAMS) for Monday, September 19, and Tuesday, September 20, 1966, on account of official business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered into, was granted to:

Mr. PELLY, for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ADDABBO, for 10 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINDLEY, for 15 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McEWEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. McEWEN.

Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. MINSHALL in two instances.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 420. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the commissioning of male persons in the Regular Army in the Army Nurse Corps, the Regular Navy in the Nurse Corps and the Regular Air Force with a view to designation as Air Force nurses and medical specialists, and for other purposes.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that

that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 6686. To amend the Civil Service Retirement Act in order to correct an inequity in the application of such act with respect to the U.S. Botanic Garden, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11488. To authorize the grade of brigadier general in the Medical Service Corps of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 13508. To direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 19, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 17787. A bill making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2044). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 17756. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase by 12 percent the rates of compensation payable to veterans with service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 17757. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 17758. A bill to promote safety and efficiency of travel on streets, roads, and

highways and by railroad by establishing a program of grants-in-aid for rerouting certain railroad tracks which run through cities and towns, the construction of railroad overpasses and underpasses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 17759. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN:

H.R. 17760. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 17761. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIDER:

H.R. 17762. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct certain expenses paid by him for special training furnished to individuals who are physically or mentally handicapped; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 17763. A bill to require all insured banks to clear checks at par; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MARTIN of Alabama:

H.R. 17764. A bill to amend title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 17765. A bill to amend the act of September 30, 1961 (75 Stat. 732); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 17766. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 17767. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 17768. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 17769. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 17770. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 17771. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or

use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 17772. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 17773. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 17774. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 17775. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 17776. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 17777. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 17778. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H.R. 17787. A bill making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H. Con. Res. 1009. Concurrent resolution to urge that the President increase tariffs on papermaking machinery in accordance with the procedures of article XXVIII of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS:

H.R. 17779. A bill for the relief of Antonio Jose Moreno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.



By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 17780. A bill for the relief of Jacqueline Mevs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 17781. A bill for the relief of Mid-States Steel & Wire Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 17782. A bill for the relief of Alfredo V. Castro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17783. A bill for the relief of Rodolfo Respicio Dacanay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17784. A bill for the relief of Rosario Pozas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 17785. A bill for the relief of Richard B. Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 17786. A bill for the relief of Dr. Leopoldo A. Manzanilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### Another Honor for the Duchess; Theta Sigma Phi Honors Esther Van Wagoner Tufty With Its Highest Award

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 15, 1966

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like today to recognize one of America's great newswomen, Mrs. Esther Van Wagoner Tufty, and to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives the most recent of the many honors that have come to this outstanding member of the Washington scene.

Top flight journalist, astute political observer, hard digger of the facts, respected member of the press corps, able chief of a major news bureau, devoted mother, all these descriptions fit one of my closest friends, whose affectionate sobriquet is "the Duchess."

Last month, Esther Tufty was one of four women in the fields of journalism and communications to receive the coveted National Headliner of the Year Award from Theta Sigma Phi, the women's national journalism fraternity. The fact that the "Duchess" had been tapped for such recognition came as no surprise to me, for I have long been aware of her outstanding qualities as one of the leading women in her field.

The award, which is the fraternity's highest, was presented to Mrs. Tufty in Fort Worth on August 18. She was particularly cited for her preeminent stature in journalism. For three decades, she has headed the Tufty News Bureau, the largest run by a woman and one of the largest in Washington. Mrs. Tufty is a former president of the Women's National Press Club and is 1 of 50 influential women chosen by Secretary of Defense McNamara to serve on DACOWITS—Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services.

Other awards have included a recent one from Delta Sigma Theta, interracial women's public service organization, and another in 1963, when she received a Distinguished Service Award from the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped for her work on that committee and articles promoting the hiring of the handicapped.

In 1960, Mrs. Tufty was elected president of the American Women in Radio & Television. In 1965, she traveled to South Africa and Rhodesia, made two Radio Free Europe inspection trips and spoke in several foreign countries.

Esther Tufty comes from a politically prominent Michigan family, and her brother, Murray D. Van Wagoner, is a former Governor of that State. She now resides in a historic house on the banks of the Potomac River that was an original part of the Mount Vernon estate.

In addition to representing eight Michigan newspapers and two Michigan press associations in the Nation's Capital, Mrs. Tufty represents the Ogdensburg, N.Y., Journal, the Ogdensburg, N.Y., Advance-News, the Massena, N.Y., Observer, and the Potsdam, N.Y., Courier-Freeman, all published in my congressional district.

The distinguished minority leader of the House of Representatives, the Honorable GERALD R. FORD, JR., of Michigan, was talking with me just yesterday about Mrs. Tufty, and he wishes to join me in expressing words of special tribute and deep appreciation to her for her many years of unwavering dedication to the importance of a free and responsible press. GERRY FORD is well aware of the contribution made to Michigan by the Van Wagoner family, both in the field of government and in the field of journalism, and he has asked that I include his best wishes as I recognize Mrs. Tufty today.

Mr. Speaker, upon my arrival in Washington as a freshman Member of the House of Representatives more than a year ago, one of the first persons I sought out was Esther Tufty, for already I had come to know of her keen grasp of matters political, of the immense respect held for her by leading figures of government and the press, and, very frankly, I knew that she was one of those persons that every newcomer to the Congress needs to depend upon for wise counsel.

The "Duchess" has given me that wise counsel, but only when I have asked her for it. Even more, she has brought warmth and humor and good feeling into our interviews, and this has made such occasions the more pleasant for me.

I am delighted today to pay tribute to this grand lady of letters, and it is my fond and sincere hope that she will continue to provide the readers in my district with top coverage of the affairs of our Nation for many years to come.

### Minshall Again Brings Traveling Office to District

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 15, 1966

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, for the past 12 years it has been my privilege and honor to represent the citizens of the 23d Congressional District of Ohio in the U.S. House of Representatives.

As the Representative of this outstanding district, I make every effort not only to keep well informed on the opinions of the people through personal contact, but also attempt to be of the greatest possible service to those who have problems involving Federal departments and agencies. To help accomplish this, I maintain a year-round congressional office in room 525 of the Federal Building in downtown Cleveland.

Throughout my six terms in Congress I have made every effort to keep the people informed about the national scene. My newsletter, the Washington Report, periodically summarizes major legislative activities of the Congress and other issues confronting the Nation.

During my service in Washington, I have considered it of primary importance to be present at the Capitol whenever the Congress is in session in order to participate in committee work and to vote on legislation. Because of the intensive daily legislative and committee schedule last year and this, with Congress in almost continuous session, I have not been able to return to Cleveland as frequently as I would like.

My Appropriations Committee assignments are particularly time consuming. In addition to membership on the Department of Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I also serve on the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee, which encompasses the budgets of 22 important Federal agencies. Combined, my subcommittee responsibilities involve nearly two-thirds of the total national budget and of necessity require many hours of work in locked-door sessions on Capitol Hill and on-the-spot committee investigations.

Because so much time must be spent in Washington, I initiated a practice 12